TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
								V4.2 INCREMENT 1					
PCO	4.1b				1085-0003		APPROVAL PROCESS	***System Allows Approval/Release of Solicitation With An Unapproved Organization*** PD2 allows a user to approve and release a solicitation using an "unapproved" organization.	1		4	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	M5067	2	1201M-0052			CLAUSE	***PD2 Does Not Allow Fill-In Information for FAR 52.222-26 Alt 1*** PD2 lists the basic FAR 52.222-26 as a "fill-in" clause but does not contain the Alternate 1 language or a place to fill-in the required information. FAR 52.222-26 (Equal Opportunity) has an "Alternate 1" version which requires a fill-in by the user. The basic clause does not have a fill-in.	1		2	4.2 Core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR03					PRINT	***System Alteration of Released Contract Documents. (Procurement Profile)*** **When** When a user's Procurement Profile is deleted, any documents previously signed by that user lose their bitmap signature.	1		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR08					CLAUSE	***SA Assigned Local Clauses "By Full Text" Appear in Document as "By Reference"*** Local clauses that are set as "By Full Text" in Systems Administration, are inserted into the award "By Reference". The user is prohibited from changing it to full text.	1		2	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0300		DD1155	**DD1155 is Labeled as a "Small Purchase Award" in Lieu of "Simplified Acquisition"** Whenever an 1155 is created the generic title is "Small Purchase Award". The regulation calls actions under $100K "Simplified Acquisitions". Need to change the generic description.	1	Maintenance	5	4.2d Core	
Mai	4.22	H7793	3	1201M-0020			EDA	***Postscript Files Created by ASF Server are 0 KB and Unusable*** Post Script files created by the ASF Server are 0 kb in size and unusable as created by the default settings used by the current installer and ASF coding.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22	J6346	9	1201A-0006			EDI	***COR Information From the PR Erroneously Appears in BOA EDI 850*** When a Contracting Officers Representative (COR) is identified in a Procurement Request (PR) and that PR is used to create an award, the COR information from the PR erroneously populates the EDI 850 even when it is not contained in the award. This issue is critical because the EDI 850 will be different from the printed/EDA versions of the contract.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Req		J6346	31	1201A-0149			EDI	***EDI 850/860 Erroneously Concatenates Funding Segments When Segments are Blank*** Per RBDCMC7, PD2 will support five standard layouts (Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard-Marines, Other Defense Agencies) for the long line of accounting in accordance with the formats specified in Appendix A of the EDI UDF Implementation Convention 003050F850_1, August 10, 1997. Appendix A says that Alpha-numeric fields will be left justified with trailing blanks. Therefore, if Issuing Dept code is left blank PD2 should put two blanks in that field. PD2 is not doing this. Instead it is concatenating the data and putting the spaces at the end of the segment. This will result in errors in funding information being sent with EDI 850/860 transaction sets.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346	8	1201M-0070			EDI	***SF1449 EDI 850 Shipping Mode (Record 63) Length Is 69 vs.28 Spaces*** When a shipping mode is selected, the SF 1449 BOA produces an outbound EDI 850 Record 63 length of 69 spaces. This is incorrect. The record length should be 28 spaces. This must be corrected so the file will pass at the DEBX.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.21	T4776	11	1201M-0071			EDI	***Outbound EDI 850 Did Not Transmit Partial Delivery Schedule*** The tester processed an SF26 award which had a quantity of 10 on one CLIN. A delivery schedule for a quantity of 5 only was established. The remaining 5 items did not have a schedule. The resulting outbound EDI 850 did not contain a Record 86 in the flat file to indicate a quantity or delivery date.	1		1	4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai			L3726	93	1201M-0086		EDI	**_Outbound EDI 850 Did Not Transmit Payment Office Information_** The tester created an SF26 contract with Block 10 (Payment Office) indicating that invoices should be sent to the address shown in Block 12. The outbound EDI 850 should have created a record 25 with a qualifier of PO. It did not. The present EDI 850 does not contain critical information (ie, payment office) that is stated in the printed document and the EDA image	1		1	4.2 Core(CLOSE)	
Mai	4.21		L6089	5	1201M-0195		EDI	**_Outbound EDI 850 Transmits Multiple Deliveries (On One CLIN) Out of Sequence_** When creating an outbound EDI 850 from a DD1155, the sequence of deliveries are created differently than the printed contract. The information (date, quantity, ship-to site) in each, however remains correct. For example, the printed contract shows the following delivery schedule for Item 0001: 31 Oct 01 (for a qty of 25 with a ship to address of F41612); 30 Nov 01(for a qty of 50 with a ship to address of N00104) and 30 Nov 01 (for a qty of 25 with a ship to address of N00383). The outbound EDI 850 switches the second and third deliveries.	1		1	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1				1091-0045		FPDS	**Opening DD350 Document Retrieves Current Vendor Data** When a Vendor is selected on a DD350, and that DD350 is set to read only, PD2 continues to pull updates to the vendor data, ignoring the read only status of the DD350	1	Maintenance	1		
PCO	4.1e3				1093-0018		FPDS	**_There is no selection for non-profit, UNICOR, other gov't agency_** The vendor categories UNICOR/FPI, Other Non-Profit, JWOD Participating Nonprofit Agency, Workshop for The Blind or Other Severely Handicapped, HBCU, and MI are not included on the DD350 and DD 1057.	1		2	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e3				1093-0019		FPDS	**_DD1057 Block E4 is exclusive of E1 or E2_** On the 1057 feeder sheets Women-Owned (WO) is under the SOCIOECONOMIC ACTION TYPE. Included in SOCIOECONOMIC ACTION TYPE are SB Set Asides. A SB Set Aside can be awarded to a WO business. E1A or E1B and E4 would both be filled in. Current constraints will only allow to be selected under SOCIOECONOMIC ACTION TYPE.	1		2	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0113		FPDS	**_PD2 Will Not Allow Identification of Vendor as HBCU or MI -- Only HBCU/MI_** With FY2001 changes to DFARS Part 253, Block D1A was changed to allow HBCU actions to be differentiated from MI actions. In the Vendor Category block of Vendor Maintenance, HBCU/MI is still one selection. The user cannot select either HBCU or MI but rather must select "HBCU/MI". Vendor Category selections should be updated to reflect the most recent reporting requirements. If not, users could not run a query on their databases to find actions made to HBCUs or actions made to MIs. They could only query the database for actions made to either HBCUs or MIs.	1		2	4.2 Core (FPDS)	
PCO	4.21		T8950	21	1200-0115		FPDS	**_DD350 Error Messages Appear Incorrectly_** With no blocks populated on a DD350, system reports an error as if Block B2 were populated. Both messages state "When B2 is not blank…" These should not appear if B2 is empty.	1		2	4.2 Core (FPDS)	
PCO	4.21		M2026	24	1200-0277		FPDS	**_Actions Still Not Populating on Both 1057 Lines (E1A and E4)_** On the 1057 feeder sheet information menu, the Socioeconomic Action Type only allows for one selection. It does have Small Business Set Aside, and Woman Owned Business as selections. Since there is another field on the menu entitled "Action Set Aside Type", if the Woman Owned Business was selected in SEA type, and Small Business Set Aside selected in the Action Set Aside Type, the 1057 should record in both lines (E1A/E1B and E4).	1		2	4.2 Core (FPDS)	
PCO	4.21		B3653	42	1200-0280		FPDS	**_DD 350 Improperly Populating Data and Changing Released Reports_** (1) Item B5G is blank when a DD350 is completed, if later updated in vendor maintenance, the information appears on the 'read only' DD350 (even though it was not reported that way) and on the reports. Same with item B5H. Other changes to the vendor, such as name or address, do not function in this manner. (2) Item B12D now returns the NAICS code, however, it is formatted with an extra '0' appended (ex. 54130.0 when the input NAICS code is 54130). (3) Items B5F and B5G are displayed in the report with hyphens, even though the DD350 reported value had the hyphens deleted if the TINs were input into PDD with hyphens.	1	Maintenance	CLOSE		

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
		RBCY01-06					FPDS	**_DD350/1057 FY02 Edits_** Enhancement to incorporate the FY2002 edits to the DD350/1057.	1		1	4.2 Core (FPDS)	
		RBCY01-08					FPDS	**_DD350/1057 FY02 (Change 1) Edits_** Enhancement to incorporate the FY2002 (Change 1) edits to the DD350/1057.	1		1	4.2 Core (FPDS)	
PCO	4.21				1180-0077		FUNDING	**_Able to Award Contract With Fund Cite That Was Deleted_** When a fund cite currently appearing on a solicitation is deleted from PD2 by the SA, the system still allows users to award a document on both SF1449 and SF26 and the user is not prompted that the fund cite was deleted.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Acc		C3397	11	1201A-0112			FUNDING	**_BPA Call Cites Incorrect Foreign Currency_** On a BPA Call utilizing foreign currency, the total cost on the printed document appeared in US dollars instead of Yen. The total funded amount for each CLIN appears in Yen instead of US dollars. The CLIN ACRN cross reference lists the total amount in Yen instead of US dollars. All obligated funding must be expressed in US dollars only.	1		1	4.2 Core	
ODR		RBODR04					FUNDING	**_Matchmaker Does Not Pull Funding Information_** When PR#1 is highlighted to create a delivery order, and PR#2 and PR#3 have been attached to it in the matchmaker window, and CLINs from PR #2 and #3 are matched to an award CLIN (s), the CLINs that are created in the delivery order are missing the funding information from CLINs on PR#2 and #3.	1		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
ODR		RBODR05					FUNDING	**_Duplicate Funding Information Included in Section G of Award_** When generating a DD1155 with 3 CLINs (all funded with the same LOA and Job Order), Section G Acctg Data displays one ACRN for the line of accounting but lists the same job order number three times.	1		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
		RBCY01-10					FUNDING	**_Incorrect Army Line of Accounting Layout_** This enhancement was written by the JRB to make corrections to the new Army segmented LOA format as agreed to between Army and DFAS.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B3653	53	1201M-0212		GENERATION	**_Document Generation Problems with Windows 2000/MS Office 97_** Testers were unable to generate documents created in PD using MS Office 97 in combination with Windows 2000	1		1	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0069		GUI	**_"Not Separately Priced " Erroneously Appears on CLIN Selection Window_** In the CLIN selection window, the words "Not Separately Priced" appear next to any PR Info CLINs. Info CLINs are not by definition Not Separately Priced, as this is a distinction that has a meaning separate from info. This is additionally confusing, as CLINs that truly are Not Separately Priced, do not appear as such in the CLIN Selection window.	1	Maintenance	4	4.2d	
PCO	4.21				1200-0092		GUI	**_"Built From" PR Button Improperly Named_** The [Built from PR] button in Award status lists the associated award or PR from which a document was created. In the case of a delivery order, this is not a PR, but an award. By naming the Button "Built From PR", one assumes they will only see PR numbers, when in fact award numbers appear in some instances.	1	Maintenance	5	4.2d	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		H7793	1	1201A-0001		INSTALLATION	**_CD Key for PMO Installation Reverted to AMS Internal Key_** The CD Key provided for PMO use (non-ams internal) reverts back to an AMS internal key after some use. Twenty users, procurement profiles, ACO codes, PCO codes, and 56 CLIN templates had been created. One user was deleted and when attempting to replace, a message appeared that the number of authorized users had been exceeded. The Number of Authorized Users showed as "-1". Three different 4.2 keys were provided and all reverted to AMS internal, with varied number of authorized users.	1		1	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1b				1081-0119		LINE ITEM	**_SF1449 CLIN Incorrect Error Message_** PD2 gives an inaccurate error message when user attempts to delete an SF1449 Large Purchase award with an approved Fund Certification Document.	1		4	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0261		LINE ITEM	**_PD2 Assigned Invalid SubCLIN Number_** After assigning SubCLIN "ZZ", PD assigned a SubCLIN with the number "[A". This SubCLIN number is not in accordance with DFARS 204.7105 numbering convention. Additionally, PD2 allowed duplicate SubCLIN "[A"'s to be entered. When attempting to save the PR, the following message appears: "Duplicate CLIN SubCLINs found. Please correct before saving." PD2 should not allow duplicate SubCLIN numbers to be created.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		L6089	1	1201M-0010		LINE ITEM	**_Visual Display for Multiple Delivery Re-Sorts Making it Confusing to the User_** When entering multiple delivery dates/ship-to sites on the same CLIN, the system automatically re-sorts the order of the visual display of the deliveries each time a user opens one. Although the database remains correct, it is confusing to the user since it makes it difficult to determine which delivery is being opened. This happens primarily when deliveries contain the same date and ship-to organization.	1		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		H7048	7	1201M-0181		LINE ITEM	**_PD2 Prints Incorrect FOB Information in Section F_** When creating an award on any form, the selected FOB Point (Origin, Destination, Other) prints correctly in Section B. However, in Section F (or equivalent), only when selecting "Destination" does the FOB Point print correctly. When selecting "Origin", or "Other", a different FOB appears. It appears that the CLIN Templates pull the information from the correct source. Section F must be pulling the information from a wrong source since the EDI 850 is similarly incorrect.	1		1	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1c				1087-0020		ORG MAINT.	**_Org Maintenance Standard Data fills four lines in Address Block_** Standard Data fills four lines in Street Address Block of Address Tab, but user is only able to enter three lines in this block.	1		4	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21		M2026	26	1200-0279		ORG MAINT.	**_PD^2 Requires Spaces for "Contracting Office" Code In Org Maintenance Which Results in DD350 Error_** When creating an organization in PD, the system requires the user to include spaces in the "Contracting Office" Code when the code is less than 5 characters. This results in erroneous data populating the DD350 since spaces are not allowed in this field In the DD350, the "Contracting Office Code" populates from the Organization database.	1		2	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0116		PIIN/SPIN	**_Latest Modification Number Does Not Always Appear With PIIN on Conformed Awards_** Depending on the document type, conformed copy cover pages will either show no reference to the latest modification number (PIIN Only) or direct reference to the exact modification number that is the conformed copy (PIIN and SPIIN). This should be consistent between document types.	1	Maintenance	4	4.2c	
PCO	4.22		E1587	32	1200-0097		PR	**_Inconsistent Update on Requisition Number Block of SF33_** The PR Number field is not properly updating when additional PRs are attached. The block displays first PR#. When additional PRs are attached, first PR still displays until amendment is released and then it is blank.	1	Maintenance	2	4.2b	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
PCO	4.22		E1587	30	1200-0265		PR	**_Inconsistent Update on Requisition Number Block_** The PR Number field is not properly updating when additional PRs are attached. Block displays first PR#. When additional PRs are attached, first PR still displays until amendment is released and then it is blank.	1	Maintenance	2	4.2b	
PCO	4.22		E1587	33	1200-0268		PR	**_Inconsistent Update on Requisition Number Block of DD1155_** Requisition number is not properly updating when additional PRs are attached. Block displays first PR#, when additional PRs are attached, first PR still displays until amendment is released and then it is blank.	1	Maintenance	2	4.2b	
Acc	4.22		G3742	35	1201A-0025		PR GENERATION	**_Job Order Number Erroneously Prints in PR With Each LOA_** When printing a PR containing 4 CLINs, a Job Order Number (which was only applicable to one CLIN/LOA) erroneously prints out with each LLOA in the Contract Administration Data section of the PR.	1		3	4.2c	
PCO	4.1				1081-0095		PRINT	**_SF252 Block 7 Cuts off in Printed Version_** Block 7 of the SF252, which is used to express the contract value in words and numbers will not allow the same amount of space on the printed copy as it allows the user to enter.	1	Maintenance	2	4.2d	
PCO	4.21				1200-0320		Print	**_SF 1442 On-line/Print Versions are Different_** For a SF1442 Solicitation, the words "See Schedule" display in Block 21 ("Items Accepted") on-line but does not print. This block is not to be filled in until AFTER the solicitation and the contract is awarded. In 4.1e, block 21 does not display the "See Schedule" on screen, but does on the printed solicitation. PD must not display on either screen or print until award; however, as a minimum, the screen and print should be consistent.	1	Maintenance	4	4.2d	
Acc	4.22		R5112	10	1201A-0134		PRINT	**_Solicitation Amendment Scrambles CLIN Numerical Order_** When CLINS 0004 and 0005 were added on a SF30 Solicatation Amendment, PD2 displayed them in numerical order. However, when printed and viewed in Print Preview, the CLINS lined up as follows: CLIN 0005, CLIN 0004, CLIN 0003, SCLIN 0002AB, CLIN 0001, CLIN 0002, SCLIN 0002AA.	1		2	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		M7478	6	1201A-0148		REF LIB	**_Reference Library Web Directory Does Not Always Work_** The Reference Library Web Directory is Web based in v4.2. When clicking on a hyperlink to select a site, the following message is received: "Page cannot be displayed". The following links did not work at all: acqnet.sarda.army.mil, acqnet.sarda.army.mil/labor/default.htm, acqnet.sarda.army.mil/llibrary/default/htm, www.dcmc.hq.dla.mil/onebook/tblofcon.htm, portal.deskbook.osd.mil. The following links point to a "we're no longer here" page: www.gsa.gov/staff/v/training.htm, www.arnet.gov/References/References.html, www.gsa.gov/forms/farnumer.htm, www.gsa.gov/forms/faralpha.htm. When trying to open farsite.hill.af.mil on the Open DFARS Cases line, it doesn't work. When trying farsite.hill.af.mil on the Open FAR Cases line, it works fine.	1		5	4.2d	
Mai	4.22		H7793	7	1201M-0049		SECURITY	**_Unencrypted Log-In ID and Password in ASF Server_** The ASF Server displays its database log-in ID and password in the clear (unencrypted) in the registry. This will cause certification problems.	1		1	4.2 Core	
		RBCY01-11					SECURITY	**_PROTECTION FEATURES: The SPS will incorporate the following features:_** This is an enhancement written by the JRB to grant system access only to authenticated users by verifying self-identification and privileges. The system shall enforce a password policy that requires a minimum of eight characters, including upper-and lower-case letters, numerals and special characters; and shall prompt the user to create a new password in accordance with guidelines implemented by the system administrator;	1		1	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21		B3653	2	1200-0285		SF18	**_Date Validations on an Upgraded (Unreleased) SF18 RFQ Prevent the User From Updating Blocks 2 (Issue Date) and 10 (Proposal Due Date)._** Date validations should be performed when attempting to save the document rather than when tabbing between Blocks 2 and 10. In this case, the tester tried to update Blocks 2 and continually received error messages that the new issue date was after the proposal submission date.	1	Maintenance	2	4.2d	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
PCO	4.21		R9776	5	1200-0266		SF26	**_When Selecting "See Item 5"(Issuing Office) for the "Administered By" Office, The System Does Not Record Organization Information_** When Block 6 (Administered By) of the SF26/SF33/SF1442 reads "See Item 5" (Issuing Office), no organization information is contained in the PD2 database. During testing, a SF26 contract with "See Item 5" in Block 6 did not match the "Current admin office" when preparing multimods. In addition, when "See Item 5" is included in Block 6 of the SF26, neither the "delete" or "change" button are present which further validates that the system does not know that an organization has been identified.	1		2	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.2B				1180-0074		SOC	**_Added Exhibit Information Does Not Appear in the Summary of Changes_** When an exhibit is added to an amendment or modification, the only text to appear on the summary of changes is a line noting that an exhibit was added. Though the conformed copy of the award shows the full information of the exhibit, the modification will only show the exhibit number.	1	Maintenance	4	4.2d	
Mai	4.22	B3353		19	1201M-0034		SOC	**_Error Message When Generating SOC for SF252_** When modifying an SF252 A&E Award to add an Inspection/Acceptance technical office in the Description Tab an Error Message results when generating the Summary of Changes as follows: "Summary of Changes process failed. Field name "tech_offc_addr_frmt_id" not found".	1		2	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.21	M6478		5	1201A-0021	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS Incoming - ship to not updated_** The shipto block on the first screen of the purchase request states "no shipto defined" even though the shipto is on the line item detail. Now the only way this block can be populated is when the shipto address in the organization maintenance in PD2 has the local code and DODAAD/UIC populated. Requesting and shipto offices cannot have the latter populated because it effects EDI/EDA. Also, when loading CEFMS with this same local code it updated the shipto block correctly. Do the same for all interfaces.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M6478		7	1201A-0022	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS Outgoing - ZLI Records - al cost field not correct (decimals)_** The al_cost field format is not correct. Sometimes there are decimals in the field and sometimes not. Also the values are in the wrong positions.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M6478		6	1201A-0023	ARMY	SPS-I	**_AMCISS Incoming - ship to address not populating correctly_** The shipto block on the first screen of the purchase request states "no shipto defined" even though the shipto is on the line item detail. Now the only way this block can be populated is when the shipto address in the organization maintenance in PD2 has the local code and DODAAD/UIC populated. Requesting and shipto offices cannot have the latter populated because it effects EDI/EDA. Also, when loading CEFMS with this same local code it updated the shipto block correctly. Do the same for all interfaces.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M6475		9	1201A-0059	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - Problems with award status file #1_** When an award is terminated, the status for that award is written with a code of 06 which means partially received. As a result CEFMS is not receiving correct or no data at all for certain conditions.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M6475		12	1201A-0060	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - Duplicate Payment Problem_** The IRD, page 12 states if there are duplicate records it will accept the first one. An error message was created that there were duplicate records (this is good). However, no payment records were loaded when there are duplicates.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M6475		13	1201A-0061	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - Receipt Problem_** When receipts are loaded against an award with multiple lines, the receipts are not posted against the correct award line. The receipt process is correct only, and only if the award has one line. This has a major impact in that most cases there are multiple lines. The payment process for multiple lines is working correctly.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	M6475	14	1201A-0062	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - Duplicate Receipt Problems_** THE IRD, page 14, states that if there are duplicates that the first record will be acctpted. An error message was created that there were duplicates, however no receipts were posted for the first record	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M6478	24	1201A-0064	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I 4.2 Install - No record member information_** In the IM, according to SPS-I Help, the user should be able to go to collections, expand collections, highlight one of the record types, and the file format, positions, field lengths should display on the right of the screen. Nothing displays on the right. This was working in 4.1e.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	12	1201A-0066	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-12) - 1IC Incoming: Failed Reject_** The 1IC transaction should reject if stock number is blank. PD2 gives no indication it rejected or accepted. No status on Reject List or logfile.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M8150	13	1201A-0067	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-13) - 1RA Incoming: Failed Reject_** Processed 1RA input from SBSS with valid document number from unawarded PR. Should have rejected IAW IRD, but did not.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M8150	1	1201A-0068	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-1) - WARRS Incoming: Incoming A0(x) Duplicates Did Not Reject_** When processing two A0(X) records with the same document number in the same incoming file, they should both reject as per the IRD. In this case, one record was accepted giving AE1 status. With the other record there was no evidence of a reject or any indication that any action occurred .	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M6478	13	1201A-0069	ARMY	SPS-I	**_AMCISS IRD_** In 4.1e when all stock records rejected received a primary secondary error message when trying to load the records in the requis.sds file. Now when all stock records rejects the prs are still processed. There is a problem with this. If the stock record has updated information for a particular stock number, the purchase request will be created with an inaccurate description.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M6478	33	1201A-0070	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - 'delete after processing' button does not function properly_** When the delete button is checked there is still a problem with deleting the second file. The stock file is deleted, however the interface agent keeps kicking off and the ALS file is now removed.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M8150	19	1201A-0071	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-19) - Incorrect EDD Status_** All AE1s resulting from incoming A0(X) should have an EDD (Estimated Delivery Date) of current the date + thirty. If the A0(x) has an EDD (Estimated Delivery Date) in the incoming file the AE1 should return current day + thirty days.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	M8150	5	1201A-0072	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-5) - WARRS Incoming: Incoming AT(x) Duplicates Did Not Reject_** When processing two AT(X) records with the same document number in the same incoming file, they should both reject as per the IRD. In this case, one record was accepted producing an AE1 status. With the other record, there was no evidence of a reject or any indication that any action occurred.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	6	1201A-0073	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF (M8150-6) - WARRS Incoming: Incoming AM(x)_** With Blank Document Number Did Not Reject The AM(X) had a document number field which was blank in the incoming file. The record did not show up in the reject listing or the logfile. It seems to have just been ignored or skipped over.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	M8150	10	1201A-0074	USAF	SPS-I		**BCAS-AF (M8150-10) - WARRS Incoming: 1CU Did Not Reject** Input was a 1CU Unit of Issue change request. Per the IRD if stock number is blank it should reject. There was no reject status or logfile status. There is no indication of what action was taken on this input record.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc	4.22	M8150	22	1201A-0075	USAF	SPS-I		**BCAS-AF (M8150-22) - WARRS AM(x) Incoming: AMA Alert Message Incorrect** An AMA was input on three different PRs. An alert was produced in all three cases, but the data in the alerts are incorrect.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc	4.22	M8150	32	1201A-0082	USAF	SPS-I		**BCAS-AF - Bad Error Message** Logfile Message E-542 indicates unable to delete incoming WARRS file, but the file was actually deleted as it should have been.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc	4.22	M8150	24	1201A-0083	USAF	SPS-I		**BCAS-AF (M8150-24) - WARRS A0(x) Incoming: PR Displays RDD Incorrectly** A WARRS A0(x) Demand had an RDD (Required Delivery Date) of 256. When the PR was created it should have displayed a delivery date of 13 Sep. Instead, it had a period of performance of 13 Sep 2001 to 13 Sep 2001. This is also happening with other customer demands - MEDLOG.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc		C3397	2	1201A-0113	USMC	SPS-I		**BCAS-MC- Contract ACRN Rejection Message failure** Several records were rejected due to missing Contract ACRNS however, the rejection message was not returned in the SPSI execution log and the execution report was not generated. Also, the rejection file was not created. If documents are failed due to missing Contract ACRNS the SPSI administrator has no way of determing the cause of the rejections to eliminate the problem during future interface executions.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	17	1201A-0114	USAF	SPS-I		**MEDLOG Outgoing: No LPS/LCC** One Medical PR was awarded and then terminated. There was no outgoing LPS or LCC transactions. The Medical PR was cancelled. No LCC transaction on the outgoing interface. BUT, the logfile contained E-513, E-514, & E-523. The error explanation is not recognizable as something we have encountered before.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc	4.22	M8150	31	1201A-0117	IAPS (IA)	SPS-I		**BCAS-AF - IAPS Outgoing: IAPS Contract Record - No Award Date** In the outgoing IAPS file all contract award records are missing the award date (position 195-199). All contract modification records have the contract award date in position 195-199 as well as the same date in the modification date field 213-217. The award date field should be blank on contract modification records.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc		C3397	9	1201A-0119	USMC	SPS-I		**Variations of costcode population in interface output file** There are many variations in the population of the costcode in the interface generated file. Different SPSI file outputs are based on the origin of the funding strip. This variation is a result of the inability to enter data in the costcode field.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc		C3397	17	1201A-0120	USMC	SPS-I		**BCAS-MC - MOD-OBLIG amount in SPS-I** BCAS/USMC SABRS SPS-I V4.2 Is pulling the CLINTOTAL FUNDED AMOUNT vs the difference between the MOD CLIN TOTAL FUNDED AMOUNT and the previous conformed copy FUNDED AMOUNT in the MOD-OBLIG FIELD. V4.1E pulls the difference.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Acc		C3397	18	1201A-0121	USMC	SPS-I		**BCAS-MC - MOD-ACT-IND** In the SPS-I record, the MOD-ACT_IND of M is only being placed on CLINs where the total cost of the award is changing; however, the USMC funds at the CLIN level and the interface pulls records at the CLIN level. The interface needs to assign a MOD-ACT-IND of M when the total cost of the CLIN changes not the total cost of the award. In addition, the v4.2 documentation does describe what triggers the MODACT-INFO of M.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	—

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	M8150	30	1201A-0122	Interface Manager (IM) USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - Editing Interface Collections_** While editing an interface under execution details, attempted to edit (change) the file name. Then selected the desired file name from the dropdown menu and hit OK. Then OK again, and receive a database error code 3 and are unable to update the record because update failed.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	35	1201A-0123		SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - Editing Interface_** When a site upgrades from 4.1e to 4.2 (SPS-I) the process prevents any existing interfaces from being edited. When an interface is edited the SPS-I program generates an error and exits the SPS-I program abnormally. Subsequent viewing of existing interfaces is not possible, all interface details appear to be removed. When you attempt to edit the interface you receive database error 60 and the SPS-I program exits abnormally.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	36	1201A-0124		SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - Interfaces Run Slow_** The interfaces are running excessive slow for minimal collections and only one user on PD2. There is concern that some of the patches which corrected previously identified cartesian product errors (36f) may not have been applied.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I -	
Acc		M8150	40	1201A-0125		SPS-I	**BCAS-AF - SPS-I EDD Transactions Still Not Producing Transaction** Processed modification to extend EDD on P.O. Should have produced an EDD transaction to advise customer of new EDD, but EDD not created.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I -	
Acc	4.22	M8150	28	1201A-0126	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - MEDLOG AF(x)/AFC Incoming: AF1 With No AE1 Status_** If the incoming PIIN matches the PIIN on the award it should produce an AE1 with B5 status. No AE1 was created. There was no indication of any problems on the reject log or the logfile.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	27	1201A-0127	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - Termination of CLIN Produced LPA_** In PD2 a modification was written to do a total CLIN termination. The outgoing interface produced both an LCC and LPA collection. The LCC was correct, but no LPA should have occurred in this instance. This was found in the SBSS interface, but this rule applies to all customers.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	16	1201A-0128	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - LPS Outgoing: Inconsistent LPS_** There were 3 awards created for a WARRS customer. Only 1 award produced an LPS. 2 awards did not produce any output to WARRS customer.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I -	
Acc		C3397	3	1201A-0135	USMC	SPS-I	**BCAS-MC - Foreign Vendor Indicator** A test was performed using foreign vendors to verify proper population of the foreign vendor indicator in the v4.2 SPS-I interface output file . The foreign vendor indicator flag was not triggered to 'Y' (Flat File Positions 725) in the records as it was supposed to, even though the category_id was flagged with a value of 11 in the vend_cat_xref table.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	M8150	29	1201A-0139	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - WARRS Outgoing: AF1 Had No AE1 Status_** AF1 (follow-up) for WARSS where the incoming PIIN matches the PIIN on award should have created an AE1 with B5 (follow-up action being taken) status. Instead it created an EDD transaction.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I -	
Acc	4.22	M8150	25	1201A-0140	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - 1RA Incoming: 1RA Did Not Produce Receipt Status_** Processed 1RA transaction for awarded SBSS PR with blank PIIN and unit of issue. Transaction did not produce a reject, but produced 3 errors on the log file, E513, E514 and E523. The transaction did not reject, nor logfile error messages. It also did not update PD2 receipt status.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I -	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		M8150	21	1201A-0141	1	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - WARRS AMA: No Customer Status_** A WARRS AMA was input, but no customer status was generated.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Acc	4.22		M8150	23	1201A-0142	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - WARRS AM(x) Incoming: No Sticky Notes Created_** Input of an AMA for an approved PR should have produced sticky notes for each PR. No sticky notes were created for approved PR's.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Acc	4.22		M8150	14	1201A-0143	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - WARRS Incoming: Bad PR From AT(x)_** The AT(X) produced a PR in PD2. The problem is that the Purchase Request Number as well as the display identifier number had an incorrect number. It should have had the number of the PR# on the AT(X) transaction.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Acc	4.22		M8150	15	1201A-0144	USAF	SPS-I	**_BCAS-AF - WARRS Incoming: No Sticky Note_** An AT(X) was input for unapproved and approved PRs, as well as an awarded PR. There were no sticky notes for any of the PRs.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai	4.22		M6478	1	1201M-0055	ARMY	SPS-I	**_CRT: SAACONS - AIRS - IRD Change - update statement regarding funding levels_** According to the IRD, page 26, #3, it states "Funding will be assigned(and expected by AIRS) at the line item level. If a hand carried PR within PD2 has funding at the document level, SPS-I will assign the same funding strip to each line item of the hand carried PR. PROBLEM: Created a pr with document level funding. The acctg fields in the hc_head and hc_line records had no acctg data. SOLUTION: Take this statement out of the IRD. The users must use line item funding since they also use the CAPS interface. If this statement is in the IRD users might use it at the document level.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6478	3	1201M-0056	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS Incoming - inconsistent error messages regarding record lengths_** In the IRD, page 8, it states that if the A0A record is NE 258 it should reject. It is not loaded however no error message is written to log or reject files. Also, when the ZDL record is NE 78 no error message was written to these files. When the ZDL record was not the correct length, an error messages were created. Keep it consistent and issue error messages for the other two incoming record types in the rq_input file. This is categorized as major, otherwise the user will never know when records are rejected.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6478	4	1201M-0057	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS Incoming - unclear error message regarding PR recepient_** When the PR recepient is not a valid user in PD2 the message written to the log file is "Database error occured during PR object creation". This is not a clear message to the users. Write a message stating that the PR recipient was not found in PD2.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai	4.22		M6478	22	1201M-0089		SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS - mo desc with multiple line items (AIRS ZDL Outgoing, for Award Mod Records)_** Where there is a mod with many lines of description, not all lines are dumped. It stops at 13 lines. Since prs are loaded with many(more than 13) lines of description, the program should function to dump back what is loaded in. There is a seq field with a format of 9999 - we should be able to dump back 9,999 lines of desc.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.21		M6478	23	1201M-0090		SPS-I	**_SAACONS - AIRS - blank deldate (AIRS ZLI Outgoing, for Award Records)_** When the deldate is blank - a warning message is issued for a mod. No warning message is created when the award has a blank deldate.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai			M6478	60	1201M-0091	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AMCISS ERROR MESSAGE** In the log files the errors are not created consistently. When the errors are R-502 or R-503 the PR number is listed in the error message. However, when it is R-501 they PR is not written with the error message.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	1

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	M6478	49	1201M-0092	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CAPS Outgoing - Corporate Status field** The valid codes for the corp status are: A, B, C, D, E, and " ". When the corp status is "not a corporate entity" the corp status field in position 444 of the VN file is populated with an "N". It should be left blank.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	50	1201M-0093	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CAPS - Log file message regarding awd_piin** When there is a payment record where the awd piin is not found in PD2, receive the message " Message arguments: 1) 2)payment 3)awd piin # 4)3. " This is not a clear message for the user. If a user called the hotline or SA they would have no clue to what the message means. In comparing this with a receipt record not found in PD2 - that message was "could not post delivery for obj_usr_num XXXXXXXXXXX - User number not found in PD or could not uniquely locate the award in PD for document id 2." Issue the same message for payments not found in PD2.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	51	1201M-0094	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CAPS - Log file messages when an award does not pass the CAPS edits** When an award does not pass the CAPS edits, only the award number is listed in the error message. This is not adequate information for the users. If an award has hundreds of lines, the user must review each line to see which one was in error. List the awd piin number + delord number when applicable + line number in order to better serve the user.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	52	1201M-0095	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CAPS - IRD Change** There are 4 corrections needed in the CAPS IRD: 1. Page 19, award record, #5. It states that if the pr number in blank that it will reject. Created an award where 2 prs were attached. The first screen of the award did not display a pr number. However, the award was dumped. Check the code to see if there is an edit for this and remove from the IRD. 2. The IRD does not state anything about terminated awards. However, the OMG states that terminated awards are not dumped. Tested and they are not. Please add this statement to the IRD. 3. page 19, line item record, #2. States that it will reject when "the line item number is blank or less than zero". The line number cannot be blank in PD2. Take out "line item number is blank". 4. Page 20, third paragraph, states that "if a line item has been no-cost cancelled or is on a document that has been no-cost cancelled, the mod action will contain a "C". When the document itself is a no cost cancellation, it is not dumped. Only when the line itself is a no cost cancelled is a "C" written to the PL file. Clarify the IRD.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	39	1201M-0096		SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - auth_amt field** In in the IRD it states that when the auth_amt is blank it should reject. When it is non-numeric we are getting a correct error message.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	20	1201M-0097	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - AMCISS - primary secondary error message** when all stock records are rejected for a requis.sds file In 4.1e when all stock records rejected received a primary secondary error message when trying to load the records in the requis.sds file. Now when all stock records rejects the prs are still processed. There is a problem with this. If the stock record has updated information for a particular stock number, the purchase request will be created with an inaccurate description.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	34	1201M-0099	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - TAMMIS - Log File - Change error message for** when the shipto field is not found in the incoming request record When the SHIPTO field in the incoming request record is not found in PD2, an error message is written to the log file stating that the SHIPTO was blank. This was not true - it was not in PD2. Correct log file error message.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	M6478	2	1201M-0100	ARMY	SPS-I	*AIRS OMG Documentation* 1. States that the line item accounting cannot be blank for the HC process. A record was created with a blank accounting line. Remove this statement from the OMG. 2. The OMG also states that for the HC process the line item pr number must be supplied. Created record with blank purchase request on the line on the local tab. Record was dumped. Remove this statement from the OMG and IRD on page 26, #3. 3. The OMG states that the award must have at least one line. Remove this statement. Must have at least one line in PD2. 4. On the award checklist, it states that the administration block must be selected on the main screen. I do not use this block, however, records were created. Take this statement out of the OMG. 5. For the HC process, it states that the line item accounting cannot be blank. The record was created without any warning message. Take this out of the documentation.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	9	1201M-0101		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AIRS - IRD Change - update statement* regarding multiple delivery dates In the AIRS IRD, it states that when there are multiple delivery dates that the most recent date will be written to the aw_line. Change this to read the latest delivery date. This was confusing in testing and could be confusing to users.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	11	1201M-0102		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - delivery date info written to award.sds file* The AMCISS IRD states that when there are multiple delivery dates that the most recent will be written to the award.SDS file. Change this to read the earliest delivery date. This was confusing in testing because other interfaces stated most recent when in fact it was latest.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	14	1201M-0104		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - update rejection criteria regarding blank old stock and duplicate cur stock* IRD, page 4, rejection criteria, #1 states if old_stock is blank and cur_stock already exists in the nsn_ref table. Did not receive error message.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	15	1201M-0105		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - remove rejection criteria statement regarding award line items that have blank NSNs* IRD page 11, rejection criteria for awards, #2. States that an award line will not be dumped with a blank NSN. This was changed in 4.1d when AMCISS began dumping all awards. Remove this from the IRD.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	16	1201M-0106		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - correct statements regarding terminated and closed out awards and award mods* The IRD states that terminated awards are sent. The OMG states that they are not. Clarify the IRD. Terminated awards are not, terminated lines are sent on MODS only. The IRD states that closed awards are sent in this same paragraph in the IRD. Remove this statement. Closed awards are not sent.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	17	1201M-0107		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - correct statement regarding blank PR quantity fields* IRD, page 6, rejection criteria, #7. When the qty field was blank did not receive error message, receive a warning message. PR was created. Correct IRD by stating that when there is a blank qty that a warning message will be written to the log file.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	18	1201M-0108		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - clarify no cost cancellation details (third position of an award number)* IRD, page 11 states that for a no cost cancellation, the third position will have a C. Created a no cost cancellation for an award, the third position did not have a C. This is okay functionally because AMCISS sees this C meaning that it is a mod. When I created a no cost for a mod, or any mod there is a C. Clarify the IRD. Take out any reference to awards.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	19	1201M-0109		SPS-I	*SAACONS - AMCISS - IRD Change - correct statement* regarding rejections for receipt types IRD, page 6, rejection criteria, #11. States that receipts will reject if type is L, P, R, or X. Remove the R. We only check for L, P, X.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	M6478	25	1201M-0110	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change -_** update IRD to state that terminated awards do not get pulled by the interface OMG states that terminated documents are not sent. The IRD states that it does. Ran test of creating award, release, terminate and then run dump process. The record was not created. Also tested by releasing award and running dump, then terminating award, and running dump process. Once again the terminated award was not created. Correct IRD on page 61 to state that terminated awards are not sent through the TAMMIS interface. Per conversation with TAMMIS proponent they do not want to receive terminated awards.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	26	1201M-0111	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - invalid unit of issue in stock records_** IRD, page 48, states that when the stock record has unit of issue that is invalid that it will be rejected. Entered unit of issue in stock record of "SHADOW" and it was ot rejected. Pulled the unit of issue from request record. Remove this statement in the IRD.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS- 4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22	M6478	27	1201M-0112	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - Remove statement regarding rejection of PR's with no matching stock numbers in the NSN table_** IRD, page 52, 3RD paragraph, last sentence states that if no matching stock number in the NSN table, that the PR will reject. Take this statement out of the IRD. This was changed in 4.1D and requests can still load without matching records in PD2.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I 4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	28	1201M-0113	1	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - remove statement regarding rejection of request records with a blank unit of issue_** IRD, PAGE 53, #11 states that it will reject if U/I is left blank in IM. The IM does not allow you to do this. SA locks you out of IM. Take this statement out of the IRD.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS- 4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	29	1201M-0114	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - IRD Statement_** IRD, page 50 states that duplicate receipt records will reject. They did not. Both receipt records were loaded. Either correct the IRD statement or issue an error message in the log and reject files and do not load the second or duplicate records.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	30	1201M-0115	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - replace 'D6' with 'DRA' for Receipt Records_** IRD, page 50, should be DRA and not D6 record. Receipts are now DRA records.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	31	1201M-0116	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - Remove statement regarding warning message to be received when priority code is not numeric_** IRD, page 50, take out the last statement about priority code NE numeric. These are receipt records being discussed and not PR rules.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	32	1201M-0117	ARMY	SPS-I	**_IRD Statement_** IRD, page 50, take out the last statement about priority code NE numeric. These are receipt records being discussed and not PR rules.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai	4.22	M6478	37	1201M-0118	ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - TAMMIS Outgoing - OMG Change_** Page 238, TAMMIS, TAMMIS outgoing block. This block includes TAMMIS normal report record. This should be in the TAMMIS incoming block.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai		M6478	62	1201M-0119	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- page 9, file; File, System or site considerations Block, Last Sentence** This paragraph is discussion AW_HEAD record when this section is about incoming process. Remove this last paragraph.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai			M6478	63	1201M-0120	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- page 12, Award Header Record #3. Add that it does not send closed awards** Page 12, award line item record #4. Remove the second sentence. Funding should not be done at document level, plus it does not populate the award records(header and line) with acctg data.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			M6478	64	1201M-0121	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- PAGE 16, SECTION 3.1.4, wrong format for desc text field and it also omits one field** It should read as: 27 - 30 DESC SEQ 4 31-70 DESC TEXT 40. Page 16, 3.1.5 AND 3.1.6 are also wrong format. The last field in the award word processing(wptext.dat) record layout and TOT record layout are wrong.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			M6478	65	1201M-0122	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- PAGE 19, #5 Regarding funding** **Page 19, #5 Regarding funding. Remove second sentence.** Page 20, #6 Regarding blank delivery. State that a warning message will be issued. Page 20, MOD description paragraph. Change #4 TO #3. It goes from 2 TO 4. Business rules block. Change from the "Most recent date" to the latest date.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			M6478	66	1201M-0123	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- 3.2.4, Modified award description has wrong format on page 23** SHOULD BE: 31-34 CNTCOMMENT 4 35-74 HOLDCOMMENT 40 3.2.6 MODIFIED AWARD WORD PROCESSING LAST FIELD - CHECK FORMAT	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			M6478	67	1201M-0124	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD-** PAGE 26, THE FIRST #3. Take out the second sentence regarding funding at document level Rejection criteria block, #3. State that warning message will be issued.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	
Mai			M6478	68	1201M-0125	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AIRS IRD- PAGE 28, FORMAT FOR HC LINE** SHOULD BE: 4-20 PR NUM 17 21-26 SPLLINE 6 27-55 SPLITEM 29 56-69 PRLSSLCOST 14 70-80 PRLSPLQTY 11 81-82 SPLUM 2 83-147 SPLACCTNG 65 148-151 PRLSPLFSCLSS 4 152-153 SPLPRIORITY 2 154 AMTSIGN 1 ALSO CHECK FORMAT FOR HC PR DESC - LAST FIELD	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6478	35	1201M-0126	ARMY	SPS-I	***SAACONS - TAMMIS - IRD Change - Remove statement regarding rejection of receipt records with a non numeric julian date*** In the IRD, Page 50 it states that when the julian date is not numeric that it will reject. This is not the case. No error is issued and the receipt is loaded without a receipt date.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22		M6475	2	1201M-0127	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - MOD PRs not updating correctly** Loaded an 03 record against an approved PR with 10 lines. This 03 record had two lines in the PRLN file. The PR MOD created in PD2 had only these 2 lines and not the 10 lines with these two lines updated. This has a major impact on users. They have to manually add all the lines that were in the original PR. Also tried to release the PR and received a database error. "DATABASE TABLE" DBO.REQUESTOR DATABASE ERROR MESSAGE - ATTEMPT TO INSERT DUPLICATE KEY ROW IN OBJECT 'REQUESTO' WITH.....	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	8	1201M-0128	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Outgoing - Award amount less than zero** The IRD states on page 18, that award with amounts GT than 0 will be sent via the interface. Created an award with negative amount and received no error message and record was created. This will reject on the CEFMS side.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	19	1201M-0129	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS - Awd Line nrsuffix field** When a MOD purchase request is awarded, the NRSUFFIX is populated. It is pulling from positions 18, 19, AND 20 of the PR number. As a result this field will have a value of 000. This field needs to be pulled from 19, 20, AND 21 of the MOD PR number. This way this will equal the MOD part of the PR number, for example, MY should have shown 001.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	1	1201M-0130	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - PRLN RCD TYPE Not equal to 1, 2, 3 or 4 not rejecting** IRD, Page 6 states that if a PRLN record has a type code other than 1, 2, 3 OR 4 that it will reject. The record did not reject. The PR records is working correctly. They need to be consistent. The PR was created in PD2 with a CEFMS indicator code of 06 in local information under document options. Issue an error message and do not load the PR.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	11	1201M-0131	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Outgoing - PROBLEM WITH PAYMENTS** The IRD, page 12, states that if the payment amount is LT 0, it will reject. It did not reject and a payment with a negative amount was loaded into PD2. Correct the program to reflect an error message and not load a payment with a negative amount.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	18	1201M-0132	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - DELETED USER IN PD2** When a user has been deleted in PD2, and incoming PR record's buyer ID field reflects that user, it should use the default PR recipient in the IM. However, a database error message is written to the log file. When tested for a buyer not found in PD2, and the PR is always sent to the default buyer. When a user is deleted it should work the same way. Since there is a high rate of personnel change, this is crucial because PRs cannot be loaded.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	20	1201M-0133	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - Problem with award status file #2** When an (unreleased) award is cancelled, the record is not written to the status file with a code of 09. As a result CEFMS is not receiving correct or no data at all for certain conditions.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	7	1201M-0134	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Outgoing - IRD Change - no error message for blank vend id** The IRD states that if the VEND ID is blank that the award will reject. The award with the blank ID was not written to the award file. However, no error messages were written to the log and reject file. The users would never know when records are rejected under these conditions.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	5	1201M-0135	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS - OMG Change - Remove statement regarding rejection of PR when PR Number is blank in prline file** OMG, page 281 states that the record will reject if the PR line purchase request number is blank. It did not reject, no error messages were created, and record was written to file. Check the mapping on this. Does it pull from the local info field or somewhere else? Correct documentation.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22		M6475	15	1201M-0136		SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Outgoing - PR RECORD WITH BLANK AMT** The IRD, page 16, states that when the PR record has an authorized amount field that is blank that it will reject. Instead received a warning message. Change IRD to state that a warning message will be issued.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai	4.22		M8150	20	1201M-0137		SPS-I	**BCAS-AF (M8150-20) - Bad Reject Codes** The way the errors appear on the listing is very confusing. The first line of the Reject Message appends directly to the end of the previous Reject making you think it is part of the previous problem. Then there is a blank line and the remainder of your Reject with a header of "Message Arguments". It is difficult when doing the analysis to differ between one problem and another which adds to the confusion.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M8150	26	1201M-0138	USAF	SPS-I	**BCAS-AF (M8150-26) - MEDLOG AF(x)/AFC Incoming: AF1 Created Alert With Extraneous Data** A Medical AF1 (follow-up) created an alert which had duplicate and extra data. Customer has requested follow-up for Purchase Request on award. Don't need the award number twice; either one or the other would suffice.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M8150	7	1201M-0139	USAF	SPS-I	**BCAS-AF (M8150-7) - WARRS Incoming: Incoming AM(x) Did Not Reject** The AM(X) should reject if the document number does not match the MILSTRIP Value. The IRD states that incoming AM(X) should reject if the MILSTRIP value in a referenced PR does not = the PR Number of the incoming file. We deliberately changed the MILSTRIP value in an existing PD2 PR Record. We then ran the incoming AM(X) changing the PR Priority to 02. The record was updated, but it is unclear how this could have occured according to the IRD.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6478	36	1201M-0140	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - TAMMIS - Mods should not be pulled by the Outgoing Interface** MODS should not be dumped to TAMMIS. When asked by one of the programmers, told her after reviewing SAACONS code, that MODS are not sent to TAMMIS. However they are being sent. Called TAMMIS and they do not want MODS - there is no field in this record that indicates that it is a MOD.	1		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	6	1201M-0142	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Incoming - multiple lines w/different DODAACS** The IRD, page 18, #2, states "an award with multiple PRs originating from multiple CEFMS requesting offices will have all of its line items sent to each CEFMS site. Created an award with 3 lines, PRs with different DODAACs. When the first PR line was equal to that in the CEFMS IM UIC then it dumped. When the second line equal to the CEFMS site set up it did not. This is certainly not sending to all sites! It needs to look at each line and not just the first line.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M6475	17	1201M-0190		SPS-I	**SAACONS - CEFMS Outgoing - PROMPT PAY PROBLEM** Tested Fast Pay and Prompt Pay fields in the Award_dat fields. When Fast Pay Clause 52.213-1was entered the Fast Pay field was set to "Y" which is correct. However, when 3 different Prompt Pay clauses were used, none of them set the Prompt Pay field to "Y": Used Clauses 52.232-25, 26, AND 27.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		M8150	18	1201M-0211	Interface Agent (IA)	SPS-I	**BCAS-AF (M8150-18) - No NSN Description on PR** If the incoming PR has a NSN where the fifth position is a 'P' it placed the NSN in the line item manufacturer part number, but did not check the NSN Maintenance table to assure it exists in PD2. The NSN did exist in the NSN Maintenance table prior to processing the PR. The line item detail NSN, description, and detailed description were not populated from the NSN Maintenance table.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			C3397	5	1201M-0214	USMC	SPS-I	**USMC SPS-I IRD Typo** According to the "Final SPS-I v4.2 Interface Requirements Definition (IRD)", Page 1, the 'Record Length' of the USMC BCAS Interface is 939 positions. That number should read 938.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai			C3397	13	1201M-0216	USMC	SPS-I	**_USMC SPS-I IRD Clarification of Rejection Criteria_** Page 6 of USMC SPS-I IRD (Rejection Criteria) item number 2 states, "An award will be rejected (not pulled) under the following conditions......If the award has optional CLINs." This should say "....If the line item has unexercised optional CLINs." Should you also add "If the line item is an INFO CLIN?"	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai			C3397	14	1201M-0217	USMC	SPS-I	**_USMC IRD Correction for Modification Obligation Amount_** Page 76 of USMC Final SPS-I v4.2 Interface Requirements Definition (IRD), Element Number 64 (MOD-OBLIG). The documentation states, "If the award is modified, populate the field with the funding amount of the CLIN, otherwise, if populate the field with 0." The documentation should say, "If the award is modified, populate the field with the difference between the funded amount on the modification and the funded amount of the previous conformed copy of the CLIN, otherwise, populate the field with 0."	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			C3397	15	1201M-0218	USMC	SPS-I	**_SPS-I IRD Needs to Provide More Details on USMC Modifications_** The SPS-I IRD does not provide enough details about how the USMC SPS-I handles modifications. AMS has helped provide additional information on how the USMC SPS-I handles modifications while testing in the test lab and this information should be included in the IRD for clarification.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Mai			M6478	61	1201M-0220	ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- TAMMIS- Receipts against terminated awards** When loading receipts against a terminated award, the receipt is being loaded. No actions should be allowed to update a terminated award. None of the other interfaces load against a terminated or closed award. Received error messages for other interfaces that "award was terminated or closed". TAMMIS does not dump terminated awards, so do not update receipts against a terminated award.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req			M6475	23		ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- CEFMS 05 - Out- CEFMS w/Army Standard Acctg** Users at the various CEFMS site, will at some time enter purchase request manually and use the Army standard accounting in PD2 to complete the accounting data. Entered accounting via the Army standard, using a real accounting data from CEFMS. When the award line was created it was not correct. We need to apply the same technique, minus the edits to create the outgoing acctg stream for the CEFMS awdline _dat records otherwise they will be receiving incorrect acctg data. Reviewed their incoming acctg data and it matches all the fields defined in the caps acctg stream.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req	4.22		M6478	48		ARMY	SPS-I	**_SAACONS - CAPS - Currency Code_** When the currency code is three positions in PD2, for example, DEM, DE is being placed in the currency code field in the PO file. This has been reported in pre rc02 testing in May, in joint testing in July - M6478-32. The users will be required to use the ISO table when using three positions. When the currency code is three positions, pull the 1st and 3rd position to populate the currency code field else populate as currently processed.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req			M6478	69		ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS-AIRS- output w/Standard Army Acctg** Users at the FT. Detrick site, where the AIRS interface used, will at some time enter purchase request manually and use the Army standard accounting in PD2 to complete the accounting data. Entered accounting via the Army standard, using a real accounting data from FT. Detrick. When the award header and award line was created it was not correct. We need to apply the same technique, minus the edits to create the outgoing acctg stream for the AIRS aw_head, aw_line, mo_head and mo_line records otherwise they will be receiving incorrect acctg data. Reviewed their incoming acctg data and it matches all the fields defined in the caps acctg stream.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req			M6478	70		ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- AMCISS- AMCISS W/ARMY STANDARD ACCT** Users at the various Army depots will at some time enter purchase request manually and use the Army standard accounting in PD2 to complete the accounting data. Entered accounting via the Army standard, using real accounting data from AMCISS. When the award was created it was not correct. We need to apply the same technique, minus the edits to create the outgoing acctg stream for the award.sds file, otherwise they will be receiving incorrect acctg data. Reviewed their incoming acctg data and it matches all the fields defined in the CAPS acctg stream.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Req			M6478	71		ARMY	SPS-I	**SAACONS- CAPS- CAPS W/ARMY STANDARD ACCTG** When completing the block on the funding source for the Army format, unless all the blocks are zero filled the accounting line is not constructed correctly. For example, if the standard document number is not completed, it does not error out in that the APC in position 54-59 is blank. Per instructions, these blocks should be mapped to the outgoing field positions. For example, if the standard document number is blank, the account processing block in PD2 should be written to positions 54-59 of the accounting stream, etc.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req	4.22		M6478	72		ARMY	SPS-I	*SAACONS- CAPS FINAL PAYMENT* When a payment record is the final payment issue an alert message in PD2. The CEFMS interface issues an alert mesasge. Do the same for CAPS. The buyers do not have access to the CAPS input files or to SPS-I to review the stats. They have no info when to close an award. This simple alert message is a must for users. Also, with so much emphasis on DFAS problems this must be corrected.	1		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		B3653	1	1201M-0050	TEMPLATES		*"Out of Memory" Errors When Generating Documents With CLIN Templates Created with Office 97* Using CLIN templates created on computers with Office 97 may cause problems when later used on computers with Office 2000. 'Out of Memory' and 'Insufficient Memory to Continue' errors appear and then PD2 closes. Word, although appearing closed continues to be active and will continue to cause problems unless the computer is rebooted or the process stopped. The errors do not occur if the template in Office 97 is not edited in PD2 before saving. As with previous PD2 versions, mixing office environments appears to cause a problem.	1		1	4.2 Core	
V4.2 INCREMENT 2													
Req			B3653	194		DD1594		**PD2 Allows Creation of DD1594 (Close-Out) from an Outdated Version of the Contract** PD2 allows a user to create a DD Form 1594 (Close-Out) against both the original award and against the conformed award (containing all modifications). Since use of the original award will result in the inclusion of out of date information, the system should disallow creation of a DD1594 when a conformed copy exists.	2		2	4.2 Core	
76			B3653	195		DD1594		*Inability to Correct Transmission Errors on DD1594 After Release* There are no warnings or errors displayed when the 1594 is signed. The errors occur when the 567 is transmitted and the user can't go back and unsign the DD1594 to correct the problem.	2		2	4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1		H7793	19	1091-0056	EDI		*EDI 836 Record 9 incorrectly showing Century* EDI Record 836 showing the Century in Record 9 Field 03. In accordance with the 836UDF Edition 1.1 dated 8/17/98, the century should be carried in Field 06 of Record 09. Field 03 should carry the date in YYMMDD.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1		H7793	31	1091-0066	EDI		**PD2 does not have separate space for Phone Extension** The IC states that Phone extension is a separate qualifier. Currently Record 84, Field 05 contains a concatenated extension number, rather than qualifier code 'EX'. This will result in a failure at the DBEX.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1		H7793	39	1091-0072	EDI		**"Mark for Party" is a discreet qualifier code for record 81** EDI carries the text of the clause exactly as it is represented in the clause itself. For instance, the Record 23 will contain 266 characters if there is no hard return and word wrap to the next Record 23. If there is a hard return in the clause for a new paragraph, PD² will end that instance of Record 23 and begin a new one.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1		H7793	40	1091-0073	EDI		**"Mark for Party" is a discreet qualifier code for record 25 – contract level** Record 17 was used for 'Mark for Party' on some contracts rather than Record 25, Code Z7 in Field 02.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
PCO	4.1e1	H7793	42	1091-0074		EDI	**_Record 23, Field 02 is not properly handling fill-ins or full text clauses_** Full Text Clauses in PD² are being presented in the EDI 850 in a Record 22/23 or 79/80 pair with the Full Text presented in as many Record 23s are necessary to cover the clause. The Free Form Text Fields from Fill In Clauses in PD² are being presented in Record 22/23 or 79/80 pairs. The first Record 23 presents the Clause title followed by the number of Free Form text fields in the clause surrounded by pipes.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22	T4776	6	1201A-0009		EDI	**_Missing Discount Terms from 860 Flat file under Record 07_** When discount terms are newly added to an award by modification, the EDI 860 Record 07 does not populate with this information. This issue occurs only for discount terms that are newly added to a contract and is not caused when changing discount terms that existed on the basic contract. This issue is critical because the EDI 860 will be different from the printed/EDA versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22	L3726	56	1201A-0058		EDI	**_EDI 860 Eroneously Indicated that Delivery Schedule Had Changed_** When issuing a modification changing the Payment Office only, the EDI 860 indicates that the delivery schedule has been modified. Inconsistencies, therefore will exist between EDI files, paper copies and PD2 Screen for Modifications. The Functional change is similar to issues SDR 1201M-0014 and 1201M-0024.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22	L6089	55	1201A-0086		EDI	**_Modifications to SPS-I Delivery Orders Contain Incorrect SPIIN_** PD does not recognize a Delivery Order coming in through SPSI as a delivery order. As a result, modifications issued against the SPS-I delivery order will be incorrectly numbered (P00001 vs. 01). This will result in SPIIN Numbering Problems. The incoming 850 tab (DD1155 1-13), Block 2 (delivery order/call no.) that should have contained the delivery order number 0334 was blank. The 860 outgoing UDF does not contain the delivery order number.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	L3726	13	1201M-0002		EDI	**_EDI 860 (Record 25, Qualifier PO) Does Not Indicate that a Change was Made to the Payment Office_** EDI 860 flat file is not listing a 25PO address when a "Submit Invoices To" address is present in the conformed copy. The 860 outbound flat file does not contain a record 25 with a qualifier PO in accordance with the 850 IRD (860-collection member spreadsheet refers you to the 850)	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346	2	1201M-0012		EDI	**_Inaccurate place in UDF of Domain Value PI for Record 49_** UDF incorrectly reflected R9 qualifier P1 in position 30-31 in lieu of prescribed position 32-33. The outbound EDI 850 is correctly placing the percentage entry P1 in Field 05 of Record 49.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	L6089	9	1201M-0014		EDI	**_EDI 860 Erroneously Indicates Changes to CLINs When None Made_** The EDI 860 Document built from an SF30 to a SF26 erroneously shows changes to CLINs when none are made. All contract level changed data appears correctly in the SOC, however, the EDI 860 contains changes to CLINs that were not made. Item is similar to SDRs 1201A-0058 and 1201M-0024.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.21	L6089	3	1201M-0017		EDI	**_"Variation in Quantity" Changes In Clause 52.211-16 Not Contained in 860 UDF_** In a modification, the Fill in Text percents were changed in Clause 52.211-16, (Variation in Quantity), but 860 UDF does not contain record 22 and 23 with the change. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.21	M5067	7	1201M-0021		EDI	**_Clause Incorrectly Appears Within Record 22KY Loop_** In an outgoing EDI 860, the Full text of an added clause should appear with a separate Record 22 stating FAR reference (i.e., 22FA52.252-2). Record 22FA is missing for every Record 23.	2		1	4.2 core	
Mai	4.22	H7048	2	1201M-0024		EDI	**_EDI 860 Erroneously Indicates that CLIN Changes Were Made to the Award._** On modifications, the EDI 860 is producing AI and DI files. These files indicate a change in the CLIN since the last conformed copy of the contract. However, the modification only made a change to the Payment Office -- no change was made to the CLIN. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	H7048		3	1201M-0026		EDI	**_EDI 860 Incorrectly Produces CLIN Change Information_** This SDR is a confirmation of 1201M-0024. Items were not changed on a particular CLIN, however, AI and DI files were created as part of the EDI 860. EDI 860 AI and DI files indicate that the CLIN was changed, when in fact it was not. Error possible due a known PD2 error in which pricing tab items are automatically populated with zeros. The EDI 860 might be picking this up as a change.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	M5067		8	1201M-0027		EDI	**_FAR Clauses From Original Award Not Appearing on EDI 860 Files_** When modifications are created, and a FAR clause is changed from full text to by reference, or vice versa, all FAR clauses from the original award should be listed in the EDI 860 File. However, testing shows only those changed or added are appearing on Modification EDI 860 files.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346		18	1201M-0062		EDI	**_EDI 850 Record 99 Incorrectly Report The Total Number of Record 46's_** EDI 850 Record 99 should total the number of Record 46s and report that number. Record 46s are generated for each CLIN, SubCLIN and CDRL on a contract. Record 99 correctly counts the number of record 46s when CDRLs are attached to ELINs (Exhibit Line Items), but if CDRLs are attached to CLINs, they are not reported. If the number of Record 46s is not counted correctly by Record 99, the EDI 850 file will error upon import to PD2.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346		20	1201M-0065		EDI	**_EDI 860 (Records 22 and 23) Incorrectly Generates Full Text Clause Data When Clause is "By Reference"_** Record 22 of the EDI 850 and 860 files should contain a clause number and date, and record 23 should contain the clause title and text for each clause marked as full text on an award. When a modification is generated, both records 22 and 23 should be created for any full text clauses on either the modification or the original contract. However, the EDI 860 file only generates record 22s for the full text clauses, and not the associated record 23s. This will result in different EDI/EDA/Printed versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	L6089		8	1201M-0073		EDI	**_EDI 860 Erroneously Deletes the POC on the Basic Award_** EDI records 25, 26, and 28 contain Contractor name, address and POC information. They appear correctly on the EDI 850 record, but on an associated modification's 860 record only 25 and 26 appear. Record 28, containing the POC information does not appear in the 860. If an 860 without record 28 was processed, it would delete off the POC, which was not changed or removed by the modification.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.21	L6089		13	1201M-0074		EDI	**_EDI Record 22KY and 72KY duplicating each other_** When adding Text to the PD2 document, and associating it to a CLIN, the description of the added text appears in both record 22KY and 72KY. This description should only appear in record 72KY, as it is associated with a CLIN. If the Text is not associated with a CLIN, it appears appropriately as only record 22KY	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346		25	1201M-0075		EDI	**_EDI 860 Does Not Identify a Change to the Ceiling Price_** When a modification is made to change the Ceiling Price on a contract's Pricing Tab, the EDI 860 file should show that change in Record 46DI/AI. The change appears in the SF30 Summary of Changes, but not on the EDI 860 file. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346		26	1201M-0076		EDI	**_EDI 860 Does Not Identify the "Administered By"Organization When It is the Same as the "Issued By" Organization_** EDI record 25C4 contains the Administered by information for a Contract Action. When the Administered by block states See Block 6 (i.e. it references back to the Issuing Office Block), record 25C4 should repeat the information from Issuing office (Record 25BY). Currently, the EDI Record 25C4 will show a '0' when the See Block 6 is present in PD2. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	H7048		1	1201M-0077		EDI	**_EDI 860 Does Not Include Associated Text When User Selects "Other" as the Authority for the Modification_** On a modification box 13 gives options for the authority under which the modification is issued. Choice D - 'Other' has an associated free text field that buyers may enter information into. This text field does not appear in the 860 file. The choice of Other is properly shown in Record 01 Field 21, however Record 2 Field 4 should contain the text associated with the choice of Other, and it is not present in the 860 file. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	T4776	9		1201M-0078		EDI	**_COR Information From the PR Erroneously Appears in SF26 EDI 850_** When a Contracting Officers Representative (COR) is identified in a Procurement Request (PR) and that PR is used to create an award, the COR information from the PR erroneously populates the EDI 850 even when it is not contained in the award. This issue is critical because the EDI 850 will be different from the printed/EDA versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	b7956	4		1201M-0079		EDI	**_Erroneous Header on 838 Collection Member Spreadsheet_** 838 Collection Member spreadsheet still has incorrect header. The header says it is the 567 Collection Member spreadsheet vice the 838.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	J6346	7		1201M-0080		EDI	**_EDI 850 (Record 23) Incorrectly Sends Fill-In "By Reference" Clauses in Full Text_** EDI 850 should send a Record 22 (Clause Number and Date) and Record 23 (Clause Title and Text) for each full text clause, and only a Record 22 for clauses listed by reference. Currently, when Fill In clauses are added to a contract as By Reference, the associated EDI 850 file shows both a Record 22 and Record 23. This will result in different EDI/EDA/Printed versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	L3726	71		1201M-0087		EDI	**_EDI 860 Contains Incorrect Funding Changes_** Changes to the funded amount on a modification can lead to rounding errors on the 860 file. Testers have changed the funded amounts by small increments ($0.02), and found the EDI 860 shows an incorrect change ($0.019999999), even though the PD2 summary of changes correctly shows the change in funding. This can result in payment delays and the paper/EDA/EDI versions of the contract will differ.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai		T4776	20		1201M-0141		EDI	**_CLIN Text Items AppearReversed in EDI 860 File_** Text Items added to CLINs appear in Records 22 (Description), and 23 (Text). When creating Text items in a CLIN during a modification, Records 22 and 23 will occasionally be flipped, with 23 incorrectly appearing before 22. This will result in different EDI/EDA/Printed versions of the contract.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.2	L3726	5		1201M-0175		EDI	**_EDI 850 File Does Not Have a Hard Return at its End_** Record 99 does not have a hard return, which indicates that it is the end of the record. Without a hard return at the end of the record the field will go on indefinitely which is incorrect. Record 99 should have ended at position 49 with hard return.	2		1	4.2 core	
Mai	4.22	L6089	56		1201M-0176		EDI	**_Modification Summary of Changes Repeats Delivery Information_** The Modification SOC lists the "Changed To" information for Deliveries and Performance Twice, when the modification makes edits to the Delivery Information	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22	L3726	12		1201M-0177		EDI	**_EDI 860 File does not have a Hard Return at its End_** Same as 1201M-0175 above, except this time for EDI 860. Record 99 does not have a hard return, which indicates that it is the end of the record. Without a hard return at the end of the record the field will go on indefinitely which is incorrect. Record 99 should have ended at position 49 with hard return.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai		H7793	64		1201M-0182		EDI	**Large SF26 Award (4,057 pages) Failed to Successflly Transmit EDI 850** Two issues: 1) Microhelp refresh did not correctly show the activity on the EDI transmission, 2) Large EDI document did not fully transmit.	2	2		4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Req	4.22		L3726	65			EDI	**_Incoming EDI 850 Erroneously Populates Contract Level Information on Each Line Item in Hard Copy_** If an EDI 850 Record 11 is being applied to the entire contract, it will appear in the extended description field of every CLIN. This will unnecessarily lengthen printed documents. It will also result in a different Paper copy of the award than originally released.	2		1	4.2 Core	
ODR		RBODR10					EDI	**_EDI 850 Transmits "Full Text" Clauses"By Reference"_** Fill-In clauses listed in "Full Text" in a released award are sent "By Reference" in the EDI 850. Full Text Fill-In Clauses should be sent (including Fill-in details) so that both the EDI 850 and PD2 document match exactly. If the PD2 document and EDA image contains the clause in full text (with fill ins) so shall the EDI 850.	2		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		L3726	52	1201A-0084	EDI (Outbound)	**_SPIIN Concatenates to PIIN on Conformed Copy_** An 860 outbound modification was written against an SF26. When reviewing the conformed copy of the contract found that the mod number concatenated to the Contract number in block 2 of the SF26. There were dashes between the contract number and mod number. When printed, the mod number portion of the PIIN/SPIIN is cut off (for example, F04626-01-C-0018-A000)	2	Maintenance	5	4.2d	
Acc			R9776	6	1201A-0129		FUNDING	**Concurrent Mod CLIN/Obligated Amounts Incorrectly Revised by PD** When two or more modifications are being prepared simultaneously against the same contract, the system incorrectly revises the delta CLIN/obligated amounts on each unreleased modification as others are being released. On the unreleased modification, the "From" amount is updated for the new conformed value, the "To" amount remains unchanged and the "By" amount is adjusted.	2		2	4.2 Core	
Acc			C3397	6	1201A-0145		FUNDING	**_Cost Code Field Unavailable in the "Miscellaneous" LOA format_** The new USMC LLOA format does not meet the standard requirements for SABRS LLOA. Therefore, users must use the miscellaneous free-form LLOA to pass the correct LLOA format to SABRS through SPS-I. However, when using the miscellaneous free form funding strip users are unable to enter the associated cost code because the cost code field is not available for data entry. This field is only visible on the funding tab for funding strips created in 4.1e; however, the user is not able to select the field to enter the data. In addition, if the user selects a funding strip created under v4.1e, a new cost code cannot be created because this data entry is impossible.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.21		F4635	11	1201M-0041		FUNDING	**_Funding is Duplicating for BPA Calls with Contract Level Funding._** When Contract level funding is used on a PR, and the same LOA currently exists on the award , PD2 shows the funding twice, to double the amount of the intended obligation. This can result in over obligation.	2		2	4.2 Core	
		RBCY00-30					FUNDING	**_Commitment Identification (CIN) and Funds Tracking Enhancement_** This is an enhancement written by the JRB to incorporate the new DFAS requirement to identify the CIN (Commitment Identification Number) when funding is being obligated. Although the DFAS Business Rules allow multiple CINs per line item (CLIN/SLIN/ELIN), this enhancement will only allow one CIN per line item, due to limitations of the software architecture at this time. Increment 3 will incorporate the full requirement for multiple CINs per line item.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc			C3397	1	1201A-0138		INSTALLATION	**_Missing Contract ACRNS After v4.2 Upgrade (Data Integrity Issue)_** Some of the records in the clin_fund table were missing Contract ACRNs after v4.2 was installed and data was upgraded from v4.1e. Contracts ACRNS that were originally entered in the 4.1e databases no longer existed in the upgraded databases. Because the Contract ACRN was missing all records were rejected.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		T4776	16	1201A-0063		LINE ITEM	**_Incorrect Delivery Date Calculation in SF33_** The SF33 is the only award document that does not convert relative delivery dates (i.e, 60 DAC) to firm delivery dates (i.e., 3/2/01) upon release. If a modification to a SF33 award is subsequently released which revises the relative delivery date in a released SF33, the system incorrectly converts the relative date to a firm date by calculating from the date of the modification rather than the date of the basic award.	2		1	4.2 Core	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		L3726	44	1201A-0020		Local Fields	**_Summary of Changes (SOC) Erroneously Indicates Locally Assigned Control Number Was Deleted_** When issuing a modification to a PO recevied via an EDI 850, the system incorrectly reports in the hardcopy SOC that the Locally Assigned Control Number was deleted when in fact it did not. The EDI 860 was correct however.	2	Maintenance	1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		L6089	32	1201A-0048	860 In (X-Commerce)	ORG MAINT	**_Summary of Changes for an Inbound 860 Incorrectly States that the Payment Office Has Changed_** Inbound 860 (X-Commerce) transmitted a record 25, field 02 (qualifier PO), field 05 = SC1032 and a record 25, field 02 (qualifier PR), field 05 = SC1032. This information was identical to the inbound 850. The Summary Of Changes from the in-bound EDI 860 incorrectly states that the Payment Office had changed from XXX Columbus **MD** to XXX Columbus **OH**. There was no visible record of a Payment Office of XXX Columbus OH in the database.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		R9776	2	1201A-0026		PIIN/SPIIN	**_Changed Call/Order Code in Procurement Profile Doesn't Pull Into New Orders_** PD2 does not recognize a change to the Call Order Code in a user's Procurement Profile, after a Call Order Code has already been set. This will cause Delivery Orders against External Awards to list an incorrect default SPIIN. The PIIN table number sequence uses the call/order code from the Proc Profile of the user creating the external award/agreement. It doesn't change to the call/order code of the user creating the order against the external award/agreement. This can potentially result in duplicate SPIINs which will impact DFAS payment. Also results in severe user frustration.	2		2	4.2 Core	
		RBCY01-05					PIIN/SPIIN	**_Assignment of Modification Number Enhancement_** This enhancement was written by the JRB to help reduce the number of misnumbered mods and the number of out of sequence mods. The enhancement includes the following changes: (1) The assignment of modification numbers are to be made at the time of release only, (2) The ability to view, at any time prior to release the next available modification number along with a listing of all in-process and released modifications to the instant contract, (3) The ability of the System Administrator to reset the SPIIN Counter.	2		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		S1615	1	1201A-0004	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I Error Log Did Not Record Rejection_** SPS-I did not create 23 of the 32 contracts in the source system file. The 850 EDI error log did not record rejection of those 23 files.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	3	1201A-0007	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I Scheduler Not Running As Indicated_** SPS-I Manager, Scheduler stated that SPS-I was running. However, the application was not running	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	2	1201A-0010	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_Silverstream server encountered deadlock when running ITIMP file._** I-M manager had to manually reboot silverstream server, SPS-I and remove .xml files from test newstand directory. Input file had 32 contracts, 112 Records 46. Of the 112 Records 46, 23 were ELIN 'attached' to SLINs. SPS-I created only nine contracts from the twenty-three on the ITIMP file. The deadlock was occurring as a result of the ASF server generating a large number of documents, and therefore locking the database.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		L6089	27	1201A-0011	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850 Incoming - QTY on the Delivery Screen did not populate._** Inbound 850 had record 46 for CLIN 0001 with field 03 = qyt of 1. Per the CMS the quantity in record 46 should populate the qty field on the delivery schedule screenif not provided in record 70 or 86. Neither records 70 or 86 were present. All quantities in Record 46, field 03 should populate the delivery schedule in PD regardless of Contract Type selected.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		L3726	26	1201A-0013		SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Administered By address in the contract differs from the address._** An 850 inbound award was received. The in-the-clear address reads different from the PD2 on-line image. Could not find the address that populated the PD2 0n-line image or hardcopy document.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Acc	4.22		L3726	27	1201A-0014	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Remit to does not appear in hardcopy or in the on-line image_** On a DD 1155 so there was no block for the Remit To address. However, the Remit To address should have populated as a clause text item. Source Document contains a Remit to address which is reflected in the flatfile by a record 25, qualifier RI. The flatfile displays the entire remit address as does the Source document. The remit to address is different from the Contractors address in block 8 of the DD1155. In accordance with 10.5 of the IRD, expected to see the remit to address in the clause text block.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		L3726	29	1201A-0015	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_IRD/CMS Correction Required (Record 64)_** The IRD/CMS states that for the codes in record 64 SPS-I will load this data to the Line Item Extended description. The problem is that the IRD/CMS should say with the exception of qualifier HM, Endorsed as Hazardous Material, which should go to the Shipping Tab and populate the HAZMAT field. It is possible for record 71 to also receive a qualifier of HM, which is also Hazardous Material, and for this record the information will post to the Extend Line Item Description.	2	Maintenance	4	4.2d	
Acc	4.2B		L3726	31	1201A-0016	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Record 71, Qualifier PK, SMK not posting to apropr. data element_** The packaging description is not matching with the packaging value in the Extended Description field. The value that is associated with the qualifier in the flat file is the value that should be associated with the value in the award. The entries for Packing, Special Marking, and Unit Container Level loaded to Extended Description because the value was not a valid value for the drop down box. However, the entries in Extended Description associate the wrong value to each of these items.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		L6089	25	1201A-0019	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860 Incoming- The "Inspect By" radio button did not default to Government._** The Accept By radio button and Inspect by radio button in the Line Item Inspection and Acceptance information window doesn't default to Government by SPS-I. The Aceptance Location and/or an Inspection Location are specified in the incoming EDI 850.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	1
Acc	4.22		S1615	4	1201A-0024	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I EDI log content_** SPS-I EDI log does not consistently state which contracts have been rejected. Nor does the log state the reason for the rejection.	2		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	6	1201A-0027	Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I Rejections_** SPS-I did not consistently reject files with value '22' in Record 01, Field 08. EDI log indicates rejection. However, majority of 850 transactions with Record 01, Field 22 (Transaction purpose code) posted to PD2. The major problem is an error message indicating a reject is being received when the transaction is actually posted.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	9	1201A-0028	850 In(X-Commerce) Interface Manager (IM)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SPS-I did not create PD2 GSA DO on 850 inbound from ITIMP_** Inbound 850 for GSA Delivery Order did not create PD2 object. Error received: "Parent Document: GS07F9-71-1-G has not been generated. Try to process Document: N00104-01-F-CA45 after parent has been generated." A parent document should not have been created for a GSA schedule, but the GSA Schedule number should have been added to the PD2 tables but it was not added.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		S1615	12	1201A-0029	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Receiving error about multiple Record 99s_** 850 log states there is more than one record, however, as shown on attached 850, there is only one record 99.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	14	1201A-0030	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SPSI did not create PD2 object from DPACCS 850_** Issue pertaining to Silverstream deadlocking. The deadlock was occurring as a result of the ASF server generating a large number of documents, and therefore locking the database.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	15	1201A-0031	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: OBJECT FOR DELIVERY ORDER NOT CREATED_** SPSI appears to not create an object from an 850 delivery order if the delivery order is not preceeded by the BOA 850. The D contract needs to be generated before the Delivery Order is processed.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	20	1201A-0032	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: INTERFACE DID NOT POST OBJECT TO PD2_** The listed awards are failing because there is a mismatch between ACRNs in Record 95 and Record 21. For all the awards listed in the log file, the first record 95 has an ACRN of AA, which is matched, but then there is second Record 95 which has an ACRN of 9, which does not have a corresponding ACRN in a record 21. This is causing the award to fail. SPSI should be able to process a Record 95 with an AX9, when there is no corresponding Record 21 AX9 entry. Another issue dealing with an IRD change will be created.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	34	1201A-0033	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SPSI DID NOT CREATE PD2 OBJECT FROM CONWRITE_** All transactions that did not run and received the error message "Missing Associated Record 21 for the ACRN in Record 95" had a record 2110 before 21AXAA. SPSI appears to be looking for Record 21AX immediately after Record 20KC. When the Record 2110 was placed after the Record 21AX the transactions ran properly.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	35	1201A-0034	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SPS-I DID NOT CREATE A PD2 OBJECT FROM CONWRITE FILE: F3361501C1003_** **_An error message was received when the file was run that_** stated "Missing associated Record 21 for the ACRN in Record 95." SPSI was not recognizing the separation of Record 21AXAA from its parent Record 20KC. This error has already been written up in SPRP S1615-34.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		S1615	38	1201A-0035	850 In(X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SILVER STREAM SERVER STATED "OUT OF MEMORY ERROR"_** System processed three 850's and then received error message	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22		L6089	34	1201A-0036		SPS-I	**_EDI 850: RECORD 25, QUALIFIER PR_** The inbound 850/SF 26 contains a record 25, field 02 (qualifier PR), but does not contain a record 25, field 02 (qualifier PO). When SPSI processed the incoming, Block 10 of the award states SEE ITEM 15, which is supplies and services. This is the wrong default. Per the IRD, the SF26 should default to read SEE ITEM 12.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	L6089	48	1201A-0038			SPS-I	**_EDI 850: RECORD 22, CLAUSE 52.212-5_** SPSI incorrectly found a clause date match for this clause and listed this clause as a By Refernece clause in the award. Since the months are different, SPSI should not have found a date match with this clause. Instead, SPSI should have loaded this clause as a new text item. In addition, SPSI should have posted a sticky note for this clause	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	49	1201A-0039	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: RECORD 22, FAR CLAUSE 52.215-8_** SPSI did not process this clause. There was an exact match to this clause in sys admin therefore clause should have populated	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22	L6089	52	1201A-0040	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: The Date Signed is appearing correctly in the online version of the award, but is not appearing in the printed version_** The effective date of the 850 is 01 Feb 2001. The online PD award has block 31c, date signed, filled in with the effective date. The printed copy of the award is blank. Page 40 of the 850 states block 31 c (date signed) will not be found in the EDI 850 and or populated by SPS-I or PD2 yet the date can be viewed online. It is inconsistent with the printed copy. The online version of the award should match the printed version	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	53	1201A-0041	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_In-Bound 850 DO Adds Extra Character in Block 2 (Order No.)_** SPS-I is processing the data in block 2 of the DD1155 with an extra character. When opened in PD, Block 2 of the DD1155 contains the order number in the left part of the block, but also contains what appears to be the last character of the order number to the right. The extra character only appears with incoming DO's via SPS-I.	2	Maintenance	4	4.2d	
Acc	4.22	L3726	20	1201A-0042	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Contractor address that existed in the vendor database did not populate the Contractor block of the award_** The EDA image of an incoming 850 contains a CAGE code but the flatfile with the same CAGE code produced a contract in PD2 which resulted in a name and address of Default, Default, Default and with no Contractors name and address in text. The Vendor maintenance records for the CAGE code was correct. The name and address in the vendor maintenance record was exactly as it appears on the EDA document.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L3726	59	1201A-0044		SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Record 2561 is not populating the Facility Code block of the award_** a. The flatfile contains a Record 25 and a qualifier of 61. The CMS/IRD states that when a qualifier 61 is transmitted it will populate block 7 of an SF26. Neither the Hardcopy document nor the PD2 on-line image contains a clause text item detailing the information for the CAGE code specified in block 7of the contract. b. The flatfile contains a record 25 and a qualifier of FA as well. The problem is the CMS/IRD say that both codes will populate record 7 of an SF26. It does not discuss what would happen if both codes come in and they are different. The IRD needs to be changed to cover this issue. c. The bigger problem is that neither the qualifier of 61, Performed At, nor the qualifier of FA, facility, have a clause text item which spells out the information in the hardcopy document or the PD2 image. Should be able to see the Performed at ID in the hardcopy document or in the PD2 on-line image.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L3726	62	1201A-0045		SPS-I	**_Incorrect "Sticky Note" Received With Incoming EDI 850 Indicating a New Organization Was Created_** During testing a contract was received via an incoming EDI 850 from DPACs. A sticky note was attached to the contract, which stated "A new organization has been created with Default Values. The CAGE is 62727". However, upon reviewing the EDA document, the 850 flatfile and the PD2 document found that they all had the same information which is "Mid-State Sales Inc, 1101 Ghana PKWY, Columbus, OH, 43220-6600". Checked Vendor maintenance and found the same address under vendor maintenance that was populating the other documents. Expected Results: Based on Sticky note, expected to see Default values as opposed to a real address in block 9 of the DD1155.	2	Maintenance	4	4.2c	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	L3726	66		1201A-0046		SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Clauses did not populate the hardcopy PD2 document_** A flatfile was received for the a contract with approximately 50 + clauses. Sticky notes were created for clauses that matched "Clause number and date" in PD2. According to the IRD "If the FAR/DFARS clause number/date pair does not exist in PD2, SPS-I will create a sticky note". Some of the sticky notes that were created were for clauses DF252-246.7000 dated 12/91 and FA52-209.6 dated 7/95. There are approximately 11 clauses that had sticky notes generated which match the Clause number and date in PD2. Sticky notes should not have produced for those clauses that matched on Clause number and date.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L3726	67	1201A-0047			SPS-I	**_Discount Terms Duplicated on Inbound 850_** The incoming EDI 850 contained a record 07 with discount terms of 2 % 10 days. The discount terms were transmitted only once. However, when they were received by PD2 they duplicated in block 12 of the hardcopy document and the on-line image.	2	Maintenance	1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	38	1201A-0049	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860: SPSI is incorrectly placing the Effective Date of the Award in Block 16c of the SF 30_** SPSI processed the 860 inbound with a date signed 26 Feb 2001 in block 16C of the SF30. The effective date of the SF30 populated correctly with a date of 31 May 01, block 10B populated correctly with a date of 26 Feb 2001. Block 16C of the SF30 has a date signed of 26 Feb 2001 which happens to be the same date as the 850 date. There is no record 09 with code 467 in field 02, therefore the date signed should be the effective date of the mod per the IC. The 860 CMS is silent. Page 17 of the IRD states that block 16c (date signed) is not found in the EDI 860 or populated by SPSI or PD2.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	39	1201A-0050	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860:BLOCK 10B OF SF30_** The inbound 850 had a date of 1999 Dec 10. SPSI populated this date on the 850 accurately.When SPSI processed the 860 inbound, SPSI did not populate block 10b of the SF30. The SF30 is populated in block 10A (Mod of contract/Order No), but block 10b (Dated) was left blank. The 860 UDF carried the effective date of the 850 accurately in record 01, field 13, position 125. Per the CMS SPSI will populate Block 10b of the SF30 Form.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	40	1201A-0051		SPS-I	**_EDI 860: SOC is listing a clause text item as having been modified when it was not changed_** The 850 UDF and the 860 UDF contained identical records 22, qualifier CJ. Since there was no change, this clause should not have been addressed in the SOC.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	46	1201A-0052	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860: New text item from the 860 file is not appearing in the conformed copy_** SPSI populated an 850 accurately. There was only record 22 with qualifier ZZ. SPSI did not process this record 22 as an add. This was the only change to the 850. The SOC did not state any changes. The SOC should have stated: The following mutually defined text clause has been added. The orginal 850 and the conformed copy are identical.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	47	1201A-0053	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860: RECORD 22, CLAUSES_** INBOUND 860, SF30 AGAINST SF1449. 850 UDF contained clauses with date changes. The statement in the SOC did not address any revisions. Since the date was not the same the SOC should have added and deleted. The conformed copy has the same date as stated in the 860 UDF even though the SOC does not address the change with the new date. The clause from the 860 should have been listed as having been revised.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	51	1201A-0054	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860: The Quantity for a deleted CLIN is not being brought to zero_** The source document specifically states CLIN 0001 is deleted. It was not terminated or no cost cancelled. SPSI processed the SF30 by deleting the funding, and deleting the quantity of 1 against the delivery schedule. If the CLIN is deleted and not cancelled or terminated, the mod and conformed copy should actually delete and not bring the quantities down to zero.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	54	1201A-0055	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 860: Record 13 , field 02 = AE_** INBOUND 860, SF30 AGAINST SF26. The 850 and the 860 UDF contained the same identical 4 records. The 860 file should not have replicated the Record 13 entries if they had not changed. In addition, the conform copy should only list the Record 13 entries once, not twice.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22	L6089	16		1201A-0077	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: An organization is not loading to the Organization database_** SF26 850 Inbound. The 850 has a record 25 with the DoDAAC in the the PD database, yet did not receive a sticky note saying a new organization has been created with Default Values. Could not find that Default DoDAAC was added to organization maintenance. In accordance with Section 10.1 of the IRD, SPSI should have loaded the DoDAAC into PD organization maintenance.	2		2	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	26		1201A-0078	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850 Incoming -_** The quantity field in Record 46 should always populate the quantity field in the Pricing Tab Inbound 850 had record 46 for CLIN 0001 which included pricing data. Nothing populated on the pricing tab.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	50		1201A-0079	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Printed version of the award is not showing an X in Block 27b of an SF 1449_** The EDA copy of the source document has data in block 27b. The PD document does not. Page 40 of the IRD states SPS-I is the source, but there is no mention in the IRD or the CMS where and what data SPSI looks at. As an added note, both FAR clauses are in the 850 and PD award.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	L6089	44		1201A-0081	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_22/23 LOOP (ADD/DELETE)_** SF30 against DD1155. SPS-I deleted an existing 22/23 loop with code 'ZZ' in field 02 of record 22 and added a new 22/23 loop with code 'ZZ' in field 02 of record 22 when it appears that the intent of the user was just to add a new 22/23 loop. The 22/23 loop in the 850 should not have been deleted and the 22/23 loop in the 860 should have been added. If record 22 field 03 is blank, SPS-I needs to key on field 04 to determine if the data is to be changed or added.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	S1615	8		1201A-0098	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Files are failing and cannot determine why_** **_SPS-I did not create PD2 objects from the 12 850s._** The 850 log did not state 'reject' and did not state error. The transaction is failing because of the structure of the Record 46 CDRL. SPS-I is not anticipating any entries beyond Field 02 for a CDRL. Since there is an entry, SPS-I should be creating an ELIN but is not. Instead the transaction is not processed and no explanation is provided in the EDI Error Log except that the processing has ended. The entry in the PADDS transaction is clearly a CDRL. So long as the zeros are included in the Unit Price field, the CDRL will be processed as an ELIN under current SPS-I processing rules. The only infomration in the ELIN will be the Line Item number since all of the remaining records are exclsuively for a CDRL.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	S1615	10		1201A-0099	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I did not create PD2 object from 850 ITIMP inbound files_** Delivery orders from a BOA do not run and the process stops and the other 850s (not related to the BOAs) also do not run. The 850 incoming directory did not contain any .xml files. The transaction is failing because of the structure of the Record 46 CDRL. The CDRL Record 46 is followed by a Unit Price of 0000000000000000000. When the zeros are removed, the file processes correctly with a CDRL. SPS-I is not anticipating any entries beyond Field 02 for a CDRL. Since there is an entry, SPS-I should be creating an ELIN but is not. Instead the transaction is not processed and no explanation is provided in the EDI Error Log except that the processing has ended.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	S1615	16		1201A-0100	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: Inbound 850 did not run - no object created in inbox_** No indication of rejection and no error message in log file.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc	4.22	S1615	23		1201A-0101	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_EDI 850: SPSI did not create PD2 object_** Unable to find source system error in the attached UDF. Suspect SPSI error.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Acc	4.22		S1615	24	1201A-0102	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_SPSI did not create PD2 objects for DPACCS 850s_** User could not find source system error in file nor could I find any error messages in the EDI log.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22		S1615	25	1201A-0103	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_SPSI did not create PD2 object from ITMP 850_** EDI Error Log States: The backup Input File could not be created. Please check to see that a valid backup directory has been specified.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	
Acc	4.22		S1615	36	1201A-0104	850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_Silverstream Server Stopped_** Partial Silverstream message indicated the process cannot access the file because it is being used by another process.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc			C3397	23	1201A-0115	Functional PR (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**Functional PR: "D" (Delete) type transaction not functioning** When a "D" (delete) type transaction is sent to PD2 from SPS-I FPR, the log files says the PR was deleted (I-216), but the files still exists in PD2.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Acc			C3397	24	1201A-0116	Functional PR (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**Functional PR (X-Commerce) ALERT MANAGER AND STICKY NOTES** An error message is sent to the alert manager and a Sticky Note for every incoming PR even though there are no errors. The alert and the Sticky Note contains empty tags. It is an annoyance to receive these when no errors.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai	4.22		L6089	21	1201M-0031	860 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_NAICS code Did Not Populate PD_** The incoming 850 with one CLIN and a SIC that populated the description tab accurately. The incoming 860 had a valid NAICS in PD. Since there is no qualifier for NAICS, and the qualifier IJ represents the SIC, PD2 searched only the SIC code table and since no match was found, it did not process the NAICS code. In order to process a NAICS when transmitted in record 02 with qualifier IJ, SPS-I has to search both the SIC and NAICS tables. Since a SIC code is 4 positions and a NAICS is 6 positions, you can differentiate between the two even if code IJ is used for both. The IRD states that the SIC tables will be searched and if the code is found it will be processed. The NAICS is not addressed.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Mai			B3653	196	1201M-0173		SPS-I	**_567 In (IA) COULD NOT SEE DOCUMENT_** After completing the SPS-I in process for the DD1594, received alert that a DD1594 had been created. Searched for the document and it indicated it was located in xyz cabinet. Searched the cabinet, but could not find the document. I minimized and maximized the cabinet and could still not find the document. The only way I could see the document icon was to log out of and back in to PD.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Req	4.22		L3726	70		850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_Performed At ID does not appear on inbound contract but is in flatfile_** The flatfile contains a Record 25 Qualifier 61. The CMS/IRD states that when a qualifier 61 is transmitted it will populate block 7 of an SF26. The flatfile also contains a Record 25 Qualifier FAI. The problem is the CMS/IRD says that both codes will populate record 7 of an SF26. It does not discuss what would happen if both codes come in and they are different. The IRD needs to be changed to cover this issue.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-I	
Can	4.22		S1615	17		850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_Incoming EDI 850 from DPACCS Did Not Create PD2 Object_** SPS-I did not create a PD2 object from an incoming DPACCS EDI 850. AMS developer reviewed input and log file and reports that the PD database encountered a deadlock situation. SPSI/PD2 needs to be able to handle large volumes of files.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Req	4.22	S1615	18			850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_SPS-I did not create object from inbound 850 (X-Commerce)._** Qualifier A2 in Record 81 is causing the record to error out. Per DCMA, they do receive files from source systems with qualifier A2.	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—
Oth	4.22	S1615	26			850 In (X-Commerce)	SPS-I	**_SPSI FAILED TO PRODUCE PD2 OBJECTS FOR SEVERAL DPACCS FILES_** User ran DPACCS files (125 contracts, 176 clins, 2,942,897) though interface. SPS-I failed to produce PS2 objects for several. At end of SPSI run, three "DATRUN' Files, and two *.XML files were left in EDI 850 Incoming directory	2		1	4.2 Core SPS-	—

V4.2 INCREMENT 3

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22	G3742	48		1201M-0179		AGREEMENT	**_Unable to View/Modify Contract Type in Basic Agreements_** The Agreement Information Window (Suggested Contract Type) was established in v4.2 to designate the contract type of awards to be issued under Basic Agreements (BA) that do not include line items. The primary useage is for auto clause selection purposes in the BA. Once the BA is released, however the user is unable to view the selected contract type since the scroll bar is locked. This will prohibit the user from identifying the contract type specified in the original BA and will also prohibit the user from modifying the BA to change the allowable contract type in a modification. This issue applies to both SF1449 and SF 26 BA and BA mod documents.	3	2		4.2 Core	
PCO	4.21				1200-0318		CLOSE OUT	**EDI 567 PCO/ACO Names and Addresses Not Carried in Outbound File** The 567 outbound file is not generating enough data. For example, the outbound file does not carry a PCO organization name and address nor does it carry an ACO name and address. The file only carries an outbound DoDAAC and a receiving DoDAAC	3	1		4.2 Core	
PCO					1086-0026		DD1155	**Large Dollar Values Overprint in Block 25 of the DD1155** Large Total Cost Amounts (in foreign currency) exceed the space available for printing in Block 25 of the DD1155. The tester created a DD1155 with total cost expressed with a currency code of "DM". On the PD2 printed copy, only the 'D' printed in block 25. The 'M' and the amount dropped down (as if word wrapped) to the first line of Block 29 immediately below where it should have printed. On the EDA version, the amount printed in the proper block, but the 'D' did not print.	3	2		4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e				1091-0044		DD1155	**Inability to Print Modification to a Delivery Order** When processing a modification to change a SubCLIN and correct the vendor information users are receiving an OLE error. Error occurs when attempting to print the document. Received the error - 'OLE Error -9: Could not start OLE server application	3	1		4.1X/4.2 Core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR01					DRAFT WATERMARK	**_Draft Watermark Remains on Bilateral SF1449 DOs_** It is currently impossible to create bilateral SF 1449 GSA Delivery Orders, SF1449 DOs off of SF1449 D-type contracts and SF30 mods to DD1155 BPA Master Agreements with no 'Draft' watermark. Checking Block 28 of the SF 1449 or Block 13e of the SF 30 mod and filling-in the number of copies the vendor was required to return with original signatures, followed by approval does not remove the Draft Bitmap watermark on page 1 or the Bolded 'DRAFT' at the top of each continuation page.	3	2		4.1X/4.2 Core	
PCO	4.1e1				1091-0079		FPDS	**_PD2 DD350 Does Not Allow User to Enter DSN Phone Number as Required By DFARS_** When a Contracting Officer's name is selected on the DD350, the telephone number is auto populated from the Contracting Officer's Procurement Profile. According to DFAR 253.204-70, "Installations with Defense Switched Network (DSN) must enter the DSN number". The DD350 will not let the user edit the telephone number (commercial number) to be able to place in the DSN number.	3	5		4.1X/4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
PCO	4.1e2		B3653	68	1092-0026		FUNDING	**Double Funding** — When matching multiple PR CLINs to the same IDIQ CLIN, funding will duplicate. Where only one line of accounting should exist, "zz" lines of accounting are appearing.	3		2	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		G3742	24	1201M-0037		FUNDING	**Funding Amount Does Not Update When Job Orders Are Included** — New v4.2 functionality automatically updates funding amounts when changes are made to price on the Line Item Detail Tab. However, if one or more Job Orders exist on the CLIN ,the system does not update the funding amount.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		G3742	31	1201M-0038		FUNDING	**Unit Price and Funding Information Pulls From Agreement Rather Than The PR** — When a PR line item is matched to an agreement line item, the unit price and funding information is pullied from the agreement line item information rather than the PR.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		S3905	22	1201M-0146		FUNDING	**Funds Certification Document (FCD) for DO Pulls Contract # into PR # field** — Block 4 of the DD 1155 Fund Certification Document displays the Contract Number, not the PR Number. This will result in extreme user frustration as there will not be unique tracking numbers. There is no workaround.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.2B1		G3742	45	1201M-0178		FUNDING	**SF26 Agreement Order Inconsistency with CLIN Contract Types** — Consistency issues exist between contract type of CLINs and what pulls through onto the award. On Cost type CLINs the Detail tab populates with the PR estimated Cost. The funding tab reflects the PR funding. For FFP CLINs, the Detail tab pulls the quantity from the PR leaves the Unit cost and Line Item Cost blank. Additionally, the funding tab reflected $0 of funding for the FFP CLIN.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		F2051	7	1201A-0002	N	GENERATION	**Agreement # Displays in Requisition Field of DD1155** — When creating a DD1155 Order Agreement to a Basic Agreement, and selecting the CLIN on the Agreement Line Item column, the Basic Agreement number appears in block 4 in lieu of the PR number.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		S7487	8	1201M-0054	N	GENERATION	**PR Number Not Pulling Through to SF 1449 Delivery Order** — When a DO is created from a BOA and no CLINs are matched or selected in the selector window, Block 1 (Requisition Number) is populated with the contract number. Once generated, Block 1 becomes blank and the PR Number(s) do not populate.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai		Mai	n2390	7	1201M-0185	N	GENERATION	**SF26 Generation and Page Numbering Fail on Large Contract (4,057 Pages)** — Using NT v4 with Office 2000, SF26 document generation failed when processing a large document (>4000 pages). Document generation resulted in excessive wait times (>3 hours), only a portion of the document generated (2,000 pages) and produced inaccurate results with respect to the total number of pages.	3		1	4.2 core	
Mai		Mai	n2390	6	1201M-0209	N	GENERATION	**Large PR Generation Failure on Office 2000 Platform** — Generating a large PR (>2000 CLINs) failed in the NT 4.0/MS Office 2000 environment. Each time generation of a PR of this size is attempted in this environment, a PD2 Out of Memory Error was received.	3		1	4.2 core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR07				N	GENERATION	**Incorrect GUI Display of Section J** — After generating Section J, the Table of Contents does not stay at the top of Section J in the clauses tab after text items are added.	3		3	4.1X/4.2 Core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR06					IDC	**Incorrect Inclusion of IDC Types on Delivery Orders** — When a Lead CLIN is carried over from the basic contract to a DO (whenever a PR line item is associated to an IDC subCLIN), set the IDC Type of the Lead CLIN in the DD1155 DO to "N/A". Otherwise, the user gets informed that an IDC CLIN (the lead CLIN) has been combined in the DO with a non-IDC CLIN (the priced subCLIN).	3		4	4.1X/4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22		B7956	1	1201M-0033		LINE ITEM	**_"00" Populates "Null" Data Fields in Pricing Tab When Creating Modification_** When creating a modification, the system erroneously inserts "00" in several pricing fields on the Pricing Tab which were previously "null" in the Basic Award. This can be interpreted as a change and possibly considered to be a new pricing value. When transmitting modification by EDI, the receiving system will indicate that the CLIN has been changed when it has not.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B3653	150	1201M-0160		LINE ITEM	**_Target Price Not Revised When Changes Made to Target Cost/Profit_** When changes are made in the **Line Item Detail** Tab to the elements of a FPI Line Item (Target Cost, Target Profit) the Target Price on the **Pricing Tab** is correctly revised. However, when the changes are made on the **Pricing Tab** (in lieu of the Detail Tab), the Target Price is not updated. This is considered to be a high priority since the workaround is burdonsome and prone to error. This could cause a discrepency in the EDI.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		B3653	139			LINE ITEM	**_Global Change for "Ship To" Address No Longer Available_** "Ship To" address' cannot be changed using the 'global change' functionality. When making global changes for "ship to address" in the CLINs, there is no "global option" as there is in v4.1e. Instead, it must be entered into each CLIN manually.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		F8207	3			LINE ITEM	**_Rounding Errors in EDI 850_** The extended line item price in EDI850 Record 20KC field 1 showed 249336.359. Paper copy of award showed 249336.36. In addition, the Base fee in EDI 850 Record 95FE showed 3443.545. Paper copy of contract showed 3443.55.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		F8207	4			LINE ITEM	**_Truncated Data in EDI 850_** The field length in 3 EDI 850 fields is less than the field length in PD2. As a result, the data truncates in EDI. (1) Record 54XE (Transport Priority) PD length = approx 37, EDI field length = 30 (IC limit) (2) Record 54TG (Transport Control) PD length = approx 37, EDI field length = 30 (3) Record 95KC (Monetary Amount) PD length = approx 30, EDI field length = 17	3		1	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		F8207	9			LINE ITEM	**_EDI Rounding Error - EDI Dollar Amount Different From Printed Dollar Amount_** Dollar amount on EDI 850 Record 95 Type 1 shows a dollar amount of 16009.497. Printed Document in PD2 shows 16009.50. This will result in differences in the printed/EDA/EDI versions of the contract.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		J6346	24			LINE ITEM	**_EDI Transmits Quantity as "Estimated" When it is Firm_** The screen and printed copy show just "Quantity" rather than "Estimated Quantity". EDI inserts a qualifier to indicate "Estimated Quantity" even though that does not show on the screen or the printed copy of the document.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Req	4.22		L3726	24			LINE ITEM	**_Incoming EDI 850 Does Not Identify Obligated Funding For FFP Service Contracts Without Quantity/Unit Price_** When a legacy system sends PD2 a FFP contract that does not contain quantity or unit price, the system does not identify obligated dollars associated with that contract. This means for all FFP Services contracts, where no true quantity and unit price exist, PD2 will receive the contract without its funding, causing discrepancies between the PD2 and Legacy system version of the contract.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Mai			B3653	180	1201M-0205		MATCHMAKER	**_Matchmaker Calculation of Remaining Cost Incorrect When Using "Stepladder Pricing"_** On the matchmaker screen, the "Remaining Cost" item is incorrectly calculated when using stepladder pricing. The "Remaining Cost" items seems to be calculated based on the pricing on the Line Item Detail TAB, regardless of the actual pricing amount on the individual delivery/task order created from the step ladder pricing detail. When using stepladder pricing, the pricing on each order will differ based on the quantity being purchased.	3		2	4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22		S3905	18	1201M-0154		MODIFICATION	**_DO/TO Match During Delivery Order Modification Fails to Pull Quantity, Unit of Issue, and Unit Cost_** When attaching CLINS from a second PR to a DO during a modification, the priced CLIN comes through fine, but the priced Sub CLIN fails to attach correctly. The Sub CLIN comes through, but is hidden from display. It also comes through as a CLIN, not a Sub CLIN. The Info CLIN is also attached, even though it was not selected in the DO/TO match.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B3653	169	1201M-0156		OFFER EVAL	**Offer Evaluation Does Not Reveal Proposed Delivery Revision** The column "Delivery Time" is marked with an X indicating that the vendor conformed with the delivery time specified in the solicitation, even if the vendor did not conform. This will result in inaccurate proposal information being displayed.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		M7478	1	1201M-0204		OFFER EVAL	**_Offer Evaluation - Attached CLINs Are Being Numbered Incorrectly_** CLINs are not being numbered correctly for each vendor brought into the Offer Evaluation. This is a high priority since this may impact source selection. There is no workaround.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		G3742	9	1201M-0022		PR	**_System Allows Modification to Original (Basic) PR/TR When an Updated Conformed Copy of the PR/TR Exists_** With the new PR/TR modification functionality, if the there is a modification to the PR/TR the basic PR/TR should be locked down. User should be prohibited from making changes to the basic PR/TR 'IF' it has been modified and there is a new conformed copy. Otherwise Error 60 - "Invalid row range Occurred in object_u_document_generation during uf_get_section_title on line 26" can result.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		P1047	24	1201M-0194		PR	**_"Data Window" Error Received When Attempting to Save a Copied PR_** After modifying a copied PR, a Data Window Error was received when attempting to save the PR. After clicking "OK" to the error window and "Save" the document was subsequently "lost" in PD. Subsequent attempts to create a PR with the same number resulted in the following message "Duplicate document number. Please enter a unique document number."	3		2	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		R5112	6	1201A-0133		PRINT	**_Out of Order CLINs When Revising/Generating a Copied PR_** When CLINs from a copied PR are revised/renumbered, they appear out of numerical order after PR generation in Print Preview. In addition, SLINs appear under the wrong parent CLIN.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Tra	4.22		B3653	117			REFERENCE LIBRARY	**_Clients Can Point to Reference Library Via Only One Path_** In previous versions of PD2, multiple locations of the Reference Library could be pointed to based on the setup of each client. In 4.2, only one path location can be used. Multiple server locations may still be used, but the path must be the same for all client installs. For example, if the server location is M:/SPS/ReferenceLibrary, then every client must point to that path for their Reference Library, though the M:/ drive may refer to different machines for different clients).	3		2	4.2 Core	
PCO					1087-0045		REPORTS	**Old Impromtu Catalog Remains With New Version Making ReportsInvalid** When upgrading versions of the application, the corresponding catalog is not updated. Reports will be innacurate.	3		1	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Acc	4.21		O6000	33	1201A-0090		REPORTS	**_Incorrect Source PR Number Displayed in COGNOS Reports_** Cognos reports are incorrectly reporting the source PR when the IDC Contract and the DO/TO are created from different source PRs. This is a high priority issue since reports will give innacurate information. Further, this connectivity within the application is crutial for consistent accurate implementation of the CIN. There is no workaround.	3		2	4.2 Core	

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Mai	4.22		O6000	20	1201M-0147		REPORTS	**_Start/End Performance Dates for BPAs Are Blank in COGNOS Reports_** The Performance Start and End Dates are not populating in Cognos reports for basic BPAs. This issue occurs in any state (unapproved, approved or released) for a basic BPA. The fields are displayed correctly for other types of agreements; however, Cognos reports display no information for the BPAs on the Performance dates.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B5691	13	1201M-0196		REPORTS	**_COGNOS Reports Fail to Include "F" type Orders_** "F" type orders are not pulling into the reports when selecting the "order/call PIIN" within the COGNOS catalog. F-Type awards will appear in the report if a modification has already been created against them, but not if they have not been modified.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.1e4		O6000	31	1201M-0197		REPORTS	**_COGNOS Reports Fail to Include Historical SIC Information_** When running COGNOS reports for historical DD350 information, PD2 fails to "pull" any historical SIC information. The field can be selected in the catalog but information does not populate the report. Although the SIC code will not be used after FY00, sites will still need the ability to report on items prior to FY01, and include the SIC information.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Acc			H7793	44	1201A-0137		SECURITY	**_"Inactivity Log-Out" Did Not Provide a Log-In Screen_** During acceptance testing, clients with NT4.0, Office 97 and 128 MB RAM experienced problems with the "Inactivity Log-Out" screen. Inactivity log-out screen appears, but no login window was available.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Oth			H7793	19	1200-0124		Security	**_Sybase Audit Log Fills Up_** The Sybase audit log fills when the ASF server uses "SA" identification to log in. This problem occurs with Sybase 11 in v4.1X because the Sybsecurity database is insufficiently sized. For the time being, the audit log capability is non functional and no work around is known.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		L6089	57	1201A-0065	SF 30		**_Incorrect Infomation Populating Blocks 10A and 10B of SF30 Order Modification_** When issuing a modification to a delivery order received via SPS-I, the on-line information for Blocks 10A and 10B are correct; however, the printed SF30 is incorrect. The PIIN in Block 10A contained the base contract number but was missing the order number. In addition, the order award date in Block 10B was missing. There is no workaround.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.1c		B3653	44	1201A-0096	SF1442		**_Overlly Restrictive Limit on Amount of Text in Blk 10 of SF1442 Solicitation_** PD^2 limits the amount of text that can be inserted into Block 10 of the SF1442. Once the limit is reached, only half of the available block is filled. If "hard" returns are used at the end of each line, the available space in Block 10 becomes too limited and will overprint into Block 11.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B3653	70	1201M-0153	SF30		**_Incorrect Release Date of Original Order Cited in Block 10b of SF30 Modification_** On a modification to a DD1155 Delivery Order, Block 10b of the SF30 correctly displays on screen the release date of the original order. However, the print preview of the modification shows the release date of the original SF252 contract from which the 1155 was ordered. There is no workaround to correct the date of the modified document.	3		1	4.2 Core	
ODR	4.1	RBODR02					SOC	**_Incorrect Summary of Changes for Job Order Number_** When adding new funding (w/JON) to a previously funded clin (w/JON), the SF30 modification SOC incorrectly states that the JON for the first funding was deleted when in fact it was not.	3		3	4.1X/4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		H7793	49	1201M-0219		SYBASE	**_When Audit Feature is On, the Sybsecurity Database Can get Full and Shut Down System_** When the audit feature is turned on, the sybsecurity database can get full and shut down all user operation without any clear indication of what the problem is.	3		2	4.2 Core	
Acc	4.22		M5067	5	1201A-0005		SYS ADM	**_EDI Transmit Incorrectly Appearing in Another's Transmit Task_** EDI Transmit items are incorrectly appearing in the Transmit Task of a different system administrator's workload. Problem is intermittent, but can cause documents to be transmitted twice if both system administrators were to process the same document.	3		2	4.2 Core	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants

TYPE	RELEASE	JRB #	SPR ID	SPR #	SDR #	SPS-I TYPE	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION	PMO Core Release	MAINTENANCE?	JRB PRIORITY	JRB RELEASE	CRITICAL TO SITE?
Req	4.22		L3726	17			SYS ADMIN	**_PD2 Allows Duplicate DODAACs With Different Names and Addresses_** PD2 should never allow duplicate DoDAACs since this will cause serious integrity problems. In an end-to-end environment, it is critical that the codes be limited to one address. In a printed environment, the user could select a different address for the same DODAAC. Allowing the buyer to select from different addresses gives the false impression that the electronic distribution will sent to the address selected by the buyer.	3		1	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		F8709	8	1201M-0169		TSA	**_TSA Flat File Does Not Include Fill-In Information from Fill-In Clauses_** The printed PD^2 amendment shows fill-in information for 215-3 and 215-5, however the flat file does not show the fill-in information. Additionally, the flat file print out had clauses listed in reverse order (i.e. highest to lowest clause number).	3		2	4.2 Core	
Mai	4.22		B3653	78	1201M-0172		TSA	**_More Decimal Places Allowed on TR/TI Quantity/Unit Price/Total Price Fields Than Other Documents_** Five decimal places is the standard for PD^2 documents in both the quantity and unit price fields. The total (calculated) amount for each line item rounds to two decimal places. It appears a different standard is in place for the new TR/TI documents. For these documents, more than 5 decimal places appear on the screen, and the total (calculated) amount shows more than 2 decimal places. Additionally, the paper document prints differently than the screen display which may result in payment issues.	3		1	4.2 Core	

This document was prepared by the Navy CMO (with support from the Navy Response Team) for use of Navy Claimants